

By Mr. HENRY C. SMITH: Petition of Edward M. McMillin and members of the First Presbyterian Church of Adrian, Mich., to prevent the dealing in intoxicating drinks upon premises used for military purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition of Mansfield Post, of Middletown, Conn., Grand Army of the Republic, favoring the passage of Senate bill No. 1477, relating to pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of druggists of Waterbury, Derby, and Guilford, Conn., for the repeal of the tax on medicines, perfumery, and cosmetics—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEWART of New Jersey: Petition of Samuel Sykes and other druggists of Paterson, N. J., for the repeal of the tax on medicines, perfumery, and cosmetics—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEWART of Wisconsin: Resolutions of Samuel H. Sizer Post, No. 207, of Marinette, Wis., Grand Army of the Republic, urging the passage of certain amendments to the present pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of clerks of the Milwaukee (Wis.) post-office, in favor of the passage of House bill No. 4351, for the classification of post-office clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Gallagher & McCarthy, of Shawano, Wis., for the repeal of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines, perfumery, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Petition of F. S. Prescott and 10 other citizens of Epping, N. H., in favor of the passage of House bill No. 3717, amending the oleomargarine law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD (by request): Paper to accompany House bill to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John J. Little—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the heirs of V. Burrow, deceased, late of Lauderdale County, Ala., for reference of war claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Tabitha Stephens, of Jackson County, Ala., for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of the heirs of Nathaniel Kenmemer, deceased, of Jackson County, Ala., to refer claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Malinda McClendon, of Jackson County, Ala., praying reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of George Cross, of Jackson County, Ala., praying reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of David Derrick, of Jackson County, Ala., praying reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Sarah Derrick, of Jackson County, Ala., praying reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petition of 4 postal clerks of Dansville, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of James Gallagher and 10 members of Branch 353, National Association of Letter Carriers, Niagara Falls, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill No. 4911, in the interest of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Grange No. 870, Patrons of Husbandry, Caledonia, N. Y., in favor of the passage of House bill No. 3717, known as the Grout oleomargarine bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Grange No. 870, Patrons of Husbandry, of Caledonia, N. Y., and B. N. Walker and 15 citizens of Bergen, N. Y., in favor of Senate bill No. 1439, relating to an act to regulate commerce—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WEYMOUTH: Petition of the Baptist Church of Ashland, Mass., in favor of the Bowersock anti-canteen bill—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS: Papers to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to James R. Brackett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolutions of the Cumberland Presbyterian Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of Mount Vernon, Ill., against island saloons and canteens—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. WILSON of Idaho: Petition of C. H. Arbuckle, State game warden, and other citizens of Idaho, for the establishment of a fish hatchery at Henrys Lake, Idaho—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. YOUNG: Petition of Grain Dealers' National Association of Chicago, Ill., praying for a reduction of the war-revenue

tax on grain or cotton tickets and bills of lading—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, favoring the passage of House bill No. 10374, modifying the Loud bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ZIEGLER: Papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to E. E. Loucks, widow of Isaac Loucks, late of Company I, Twenty-sixth Pennsylvania Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill to grant a pension to Jacob A. Graham, captain of Company F, Thirteenth Pennsylvania Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, May 9, 1900.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. RAWLINS, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved.

TRADE RELATIONS WITH FRANCE AND ALGERIA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 26th ultimo, a statement showing the quantity and value of merchandise imported into the United States from France and Algeria, by months, under the provisions of the reciprocal commercial arrangement concluded on May 28, 1898, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

ALLEGED VIOLATIONS OF CIVIL-SERVICE LAW.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney-General, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 3d instant, certain information relative to what action, if any, has been taken by the Department of Justice in reference to alleged violations of the civil-service law; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment, and ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM H. THEOBALD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney-General, in response to a resolution of the 30th ultimo, calling for the report of Special Agent W. A. Sutherland, relative to the connection of William H. Theobald with the Chinese investigation and criminal trial of Deputy Collector Porter, of Malone, etc., stating that for certain reasons given he deems it his duty for the present not to make the report public; which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

GOVERNMENT FOR HAWAII.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimates of appropriations required to carry out certain provisions of an act entitled "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii," approved April 30, 1900; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

COMPENSATION IN LIEU OF MOIETIES.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the acting chief of division of customs, Treasury Department, in relation to the inadequacy of the sum of \$10,000 for "compensation in lieu of moieties," for the ensuing fiscal year, and recommending that the amount be increased to \$20,000; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

COURTS IN HAWAII.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Attorney-General submitting additional estimates of appropriations for salaries of clerk and reporter of the United States district court, additional United States district judges, and miscellaneous expenses, United States courts, Territory of Hawaii; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

ELECTION IN CUBA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in further response to a resolution of March 21, 1900, certain information relative to the qualifications required to entitle a person to vote at the coming election in the island of Cuba, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Relations with Cuba, and ordered to be printed.

GATHMANN TORPEDO SHELL AND GUN.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 7th instant, the reports of experiments with the Gathmann torpedo shell and gun; which, on motion of Mr. HALE, was, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

UNION PACIFIC RAILWAY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney-General, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 14th instant, copies of all papers on file in the Department of Justice relative to the distribution of the receivership fund of the Union Pacific Railway Company; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Pacific Railroads, and ordered to be printed.

VESSEL BRIG UNION.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the conclusions of fact and of law filed under the act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claims set out in the annexed findings by the court relating to the vessel brig *Union*, John Walker, master; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 198) providing for the printing and distribution of the general report of the expedition of the steamer *Fishhawk* to Porto Rico, including the chapter relating to the fish and fisheries of Porto Rico, as contained in the Fish Commission Bulletin for 1900.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills:

A bill (S. 392) to pay the General Marine Insurance Company, of Dresden, the sum of \$1,434.12 for certain coupons detached from United States bonds, which said coupons were lost on the Cunard steamship *Oregon*, sunk at sea March 14, 1886;

A bill (S. 1284) for the relief of W. H. L. Pepperell, of Concordia, Kans.;

A bill (S. 1356) for the relief of Edwin L. Field; and

A bill (S. 1894) for the relief of the Union Iron Works, of San Francisco, Cal.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 1409) for the relief of Robert A. Ragan;

A bill (H. R. 2824) to pay certain judgments against John C. Bates and Jonathan A. Yekley, captain and first lieutenant in the United States Army, for acts done by them under orders of their superior officers;

A bill (H. R. 3044) for the relief of John M. Martin, of Ocala, Fla.;

A bill (H. R. 3376) for the relief of Franklin Lee and Charles F. Dunbar;

A bill (H. R. 3819) for the relief of the widows and children of William Ryan and John S. Taylor, deceased;

A bill (H. R. 5324) for the relief of the employees of William M. Jacobs;

A bill (H. R. 5739) for the relief of Gus A. Nowak; and

A bill (H. R. 6749) for the relief of Mary A. Swift.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

A bill (S. 1477) in amendment of sections 2 and 3 of an act entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents," approved June 27, 1890;

A bill (H. R. 4368) granting a pension to Flora B. Hinds; and

A bill (H. R. 8405) granting a pension to Sophronia Seely.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PENROSE presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Wilkesbarre, Pa., praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the postal laws relating to second-class mail matter; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Erie Central Labor Union, American Federation of Labor, of Erie Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation increasing the compensation of letter carriers; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Sunbury and Shickshinny, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the reclassification of clerks in the Railway Mail Service;

which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented petitions of Brandywine Grange, No. 60; Columbia Grange, No. 83, and of Chestnut Grange, No. 133, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to secure to the people of the country the advantages of State control of imitation dairy products; which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented petitions of Pioneer Grange, No. 1098; of Charleston Union Grange, No. 1017, and of Eureka Grange, No. 607, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the interstate-commerce law; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Susquehanna, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in any post exchange, or canteen, or transport, or upon any premises used for military purposes by the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented petitions of the Young Men's Christian Association and of the congregations of the United Brethren, Presbyterian, and Calvary Lutheran churches, all of Wilkesburg, in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the importation, manufacture, and sale of intoxicating liquors and opium in Hawaii; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. MALLORY presented a resolution adopted by the Democrats of Hamilton County, Fla., in convention assembled, in favor of the election of United States Senators by a direct vote of the people; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. HOAR presented petitions of the congregations of the Methodist Church of Ashland, the Baptist Church of Ashland, and the Congregational Church of Ashland, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in any post exchange or canteen or transport, or upon any premises used for military purposes by the United States; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. THURSTON presented petitions of the Modern Woodmen societies of Hendley, Wolbach, and Pleasantdale, all in the State of Nebraska, praying for the adoption of an amendment to section 4, paragraph 5, of the so-called Loud bill, relating to second-class mail matter; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. MARTIN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4427) for the relief of George W. King, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by Mr. DANIEL on the 8th instant, proposing to appropriate \$200,000 to enable the Secretary of War to commence the construction of a memorial bridge across the Potomac River to Arlington, intended to be proposed to the sundry civil appropriation bill, reported favorably thereon, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

He also, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by Mr. VEST on the 8th instant, proposing to appropriate \$35,000 to pay W. R. Austin & Co. for materials furnished to the Interior Department for use in the Eleventh Census, intended to be proposed to the sundry civil appropriation bill, reported favorably thereon, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5886) granting a pension to William H. Lane, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 911) to amend section 1176 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 866) for the relief of Payne, James & Co., reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. TELLER, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by himself on the 7th instant, proposing to appropriate \$3,660 to pay for the work of arranging and preparing the index of private claims introduced during the Fifty-second, Fifty-third, Fifty-fourth, and Fifty-fifth Congresses, intended to be proposed to the sundry civil appropriation bill, reported favorably thereon, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

Mr. HAWLEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to

whom was referred the bill (S. 1673) to grant an honorable discharge from the military service to Charles H. Hawley, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by himself on the 11th ultimo, proposing to appropriate \$2,500 for the reburial of the bodies of about 128 Confederate soldiers which are buried in the National Soldiers' Home, near Washington, D. C., intended to be proposed to the sundry civil appropriation bill, reported it with an amendment, submitted a report thereon, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

MESSANGER FOR COMMITTEE.

Mr. JONES of Nevada, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate be, and he is hereby, directed to appoint a messenger for the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, whose services shall be devoted exclusively to the business of said committee, and that the messenger so appointed shall be selected by said committee and paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$1,440 per annum until otherwise provided for by law.

THOMAS D. GOLD.

Mr. MARTIN, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 787) for the relief of Thomas D. Gold, administrator of Zebedee Gray, of Clarke County, State of Virginia, reported the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 787) entitled "A bill for the relief of Thomas D. Gold, administrator of Zebedee Gray, of Clarke County, State of Virginia," now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, be, and the same is hereby, referred to the Court of Claims, in pursuance of the provisions of an act entitled "An act to provide for the bringing of suits against the Government of the United States," approved March 3, 1887. And the said court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of such act, and report to the Senate in accordance therewith.

THOMAS B. SMITH.

Mr. KEAN, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2820) for the relief of Thomas B. Smith, administrator of Thomas S. Hardaway, reported the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 2820) entitled "A bill for the relief of Thomas B. Smith, administrator of Thomas S. Hardaway," now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, be, and the same is hereby, referred to the Court of Claims, in pursuance of the provisions of an act entitled "An act to provide for the bringing of suits against the Government of the United States," approved March 3, 1887. And the said court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of such act, and report to the Senate in accordance therewith.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. PENROSE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 4619) granting an increase of pension to Frances Gray;
A bill (S. 4620) granting an increase of pension to William D. Johnson;

A bill (S. 4621) granting an increase of pension to Mary Von Kusserow; and

A bill (S. 4622) granting an increase of pension to John Stauffer.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 4623) to remit the sentence of general court-martial against Milton Osthein, late a private of Company H, Twelfth United States Infantry, and grant him an honorable discharge; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4624) to correct the military record of George Adams; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4625) for the relief of Jane W. Mason; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4626) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Newcastle, in the State of Pennsylvania; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. BATE introduced a bill (S. 4627) for the relief of Davidson County, in the State of Tennessee; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 4628) for the relief of Mary B. Spencer, administratrix of Albert G. Boone, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. SPOONER introduced a bill (S. 4629) to amend sections 2597 and 2598 of the Revised Statutes relating to customs districts and customs officers in the State of Wisconsin; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4630) granting an increase of pension to James H. Bellinger; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENTS TO SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PENROSE submitted an amendment directing the Secretary of the Treasury to reexamine and readjust the claim of the State of Pennsylvania for money expended in aid of the suppression of the war of the rebellion, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$3,389.08 to pay Edward Bedloe, late consul-general of the United States at Canton, China, balance of salary due him, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MALLORY submitted an amendment proposing to increase the limit of cost for public building at Tampa, Fla., from \$250,000 to \$350,000, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$30,000 for completing the improvement of the military roadway from Pensacola, Fla., to the national cemetery near that city, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CLAY submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$10,000 to construct a road from Graysville, Ga., to the Chickamauga National Military Park, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TURNER submitted an amendment directing the Secretary of War to appoint a board of officers to make an examination and prepare estimates for the improvement of Snake River, in the States of Idaho and Washington, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to make appropriations for continuing the improvement of Cowlitz River, Skagit River, Olympia Harbor, etc., all in the State of Washington, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SHOUP submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$2,070 to pay the legal representatives of Gilman Sawtelle, Priest River, Idaho, for remuneration for damages done to his property by United States troops, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$2,400 to pay the heirs of Darius B. Randall, deceased, for certain improvements situated on the Nez Perce Indian Reservation, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. FORAKER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$3,000 for the erection of a monument on the battlefield at Old Fort Piqua, Clark County, Ohio, to commemorate the victory of Col. George Rogers Clark and the Kentucky soldiers under his command, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. FOSTER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$300,000 for the establishment of joint light-houses and fog-signal stations in Alaskan waters, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BARD submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$50,000 for the construction of a wagon road within the boundary of the Yosemite National Park, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$31,300 for the protection of Sequoia National Park, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$50,000 for the purchase and making free of any one of the toll roads in the Yosemite National Park which the Secretary of the Interior may select, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

INVESTIGATION OF PANAMA CANAL.

Mr. MORGAN. I move that House Report No. 2615, Fifty-second Congress, second session, being a report from the Special Committee to Investigate the Panama Canal Company, etc., be reprinted.

The motion was agreed to.

ANTONIO Q. LOVELL AND OTHERS.

Mr. MONEY submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Claims:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 4278) entitled "A bill for the relief of Antonio Q. Lovell and others," now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, be, and the same is hereby, referred to the Court of Claims, in pursuance of the provisions of an act entitled "An act to provide for the bringing of suits against the Government of the United States," approved March 3, 1887. And the said court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of such act, and report to the Senate in accordance therewith.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (H. R. 1409) for the relief of Robert A. Ragan;

A bill (H. R. 2824) to pay certain judgments against John C. Bates and Jonathan A. Yeckley, captain and first lieutenant in the United States Army, for acts done by them under orders of their superior officers;

A bill (H. R. 3044) for the relief of John M. Martin, of Ocala, Fla.;

A bill (H. R. 3376) for the relief of Franklin Lee and Charles F. Dunbar;

A bill (H. R. 3319) for the relief of the widows and children of William Ryan and John S. Taylor, deceased;

A bill (H. R. 5324) for the relief of the employees of William M. Jacobs;

A bill (H. R. 5739) for the relief of Gus A. Nowak; and

A bill (H. R. 6749) for the relief of Mary A. Swift.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business?

Mr. HALE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The morning business is closed.

Mr. HALE. I ask that the naval appropriation bill be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the naval appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10450) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, when the Senate ended consideration of this bill for yesterday it was in secret session, which had been brought about by the motion of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN]. I leave it now to the Senator from South Carolina in the present condition to take such course as he deems wise as to going on in open session or going into secret session.

Mr. TILLMAN. Well, Mr. President, remembering what occurred in the Senate yesterday, and the predictions that were made as to what would appear in the newspapers this morning, I really feel that any attempt to keep the matters we were discussing from being made public is almost hopeless. It will be remembered by those who were present yesterday afternoon and who have read the morning paper that there is a great deal more in the paper than was brought out here. So it appears that we may reasonably—

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I rise to a question of order.

Mr. VEST. I rise to a question of order.

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. VEST. I suggest that we had better go into secret session if that sort of a remark is to be made.

Mr. CHANDLER. Such, I understand, is the vote of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri moves—

Mr. TILLMAN. I hope the Senator will let me get through with my observation.

Mr. VEST. I make the motion because I think the statement of the Senator does exactly what we wish to prevent. He is now going on to state that in view of what is published in the papers this morning it is useless to go into secret session. That is an advertisement to the public that the papers reported correctly what occurred here.

Mr. CHANDLER. I join in the motion of the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Sergeant-at-Arms will clear the galleries and close the doors.

The Senate (at 12 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) proceeded to deliberate with closed doors, and at 1 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m. the doors were reopened.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, if I can have the attention of the Senate I will do what I ordinarily would not do upon an appropriation bill, proceed to argue it before objection has been made; but I know that this proposition involves the whole contest, and that we will have it before us to-day.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I will relieve the embarrassment of the Senator from Maine, if he will permit me, by offering an amendment to the Senate amendment, so that he will then have a basis upon which to speak.

Mr. HALE. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. TILLMAN. On page 65, in line 23, after the word "dollars," I move to strike out down to and including the word "royalties," in line 4 on page 66; then, in line 6, page 66, after the word "above," I move to insert "at \$300 per long ton;" then, in line 12, after the word "That," I move to strike out the word "if;" then I move to strike out everything after the word "Navy," in line 12, down to and including the word "he," in line 17.

If Senators will get their bills and make these corrections, they will then be able to grasp the purport of the amendment proposed by the committee as it would read after this amendment of mine has been incorporated into it.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Will the Senator again state the amendment?

Mr. PETTUS. Let the amendment be read from the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

Mr. ALLISON. What does the Senator propose to substitute for the language contained between line 6 and line 12?

Mr. TILLMAN. I leave that there.

Mr. BACON. Now, can not the Senator state succinctly exactly what is proposed by the amendment?

Mr. ALLISON. I ask that the amendment may be read.

Mr. TILLMAN. I will read it, so as to be sure that Senators will have it right.

Commencing on line 23, on page 65, after the word "dollars," strike out down to and including the word "royalties," in line 4 on page 66. It will then read:

If, after due advertisement, the Secretary of the Navy should be unable to contract for such armor designated above at \$300 per long ton, then and in that event the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to procure armor of the best quality for the battle ships *Maine*, *Ohio*, and *Missouri*, now awaiting armor, and to pay therefor not to exceed \$545 per ton of 2,240 pounds: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy—

Now, go down to line 17, striking out the rest, and it will read: is hereby directed to procure or purchase a suitable site and erect thereon an armor-plate factory, etc.

Mr. President, unless the Senator from Maine wishes to go on, I will explain. I say I offer these amendments in order to give the Senator from Maine an opportunity to speak. If he prefers, I will open the matter a little and then let him come in, or let him go on now.

Mr. HALE. I will go on now.

Mr. ALLISON. Will the Senator from Maine permit me a moment?

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. ALLISON. Do I understand that these are the two rival propositions which are now presented for debate?

Mr. HALE. Undoubtedly—the modification proposed by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] and the amendment proposed by the majority of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. CHANDLER. It seems to me, Mr. President, that the motion made should be understood at the desk, for we are going to vote on it after a while, and before it is argued I ask that it be read.

Mr. TILLMAN. I ask that it be read. I desire to see if the clerks have got the amendment down correctly.

Mr. HAWLEY. Let the amendment of the committee be read as it will stand if the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina be agreed to.

Mr. STEWART. Let the amendment be read as it is proposed to be amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the amendment of the committee as proposed to be amended.

The Secretary proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. HALE. Is the Secretary proposing to read the amendment as proposed to be amended by the Senator from South Carolina?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary is reading the entire amendment as proposed to be amended by the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HALE. Very well.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend the amendment reported by the Committee on Naval Affairs after line 13, on page 65, so as to read as follows:

Armor and armament: Toward the armament and armor of domestic manufacture for the vessels authorized by act of March 2, 1895; for those authorized by the act of June 10, 1896; for those authorized by the act of March 3, 1897; for those authorized by the act of May 4, 1898; for those authorized by the act of March 3, 1899, and for those authorized by this act, \$4,000,000. If, after due advertisement, the Secretary of the Navy should be unable to contract for such armor designated above at \$300 per long ton, then, and in that event, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to procure armor of the best quality for the battle ships *Maine*, *Ohio*, and *Missouri*, now awaiting armor, and to pay therefor not to exceed \$545 per ton of 2,240 pounds: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby directed to procure or purchase a suitable site and erect thereon an armor-plate factory at a cost not to exceed \$4,000,000; and to carry out the purposes of this provision the sum of \$2,000,000 dollars is hereby appropriated and made immediately available, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. And in no case shall a contract be made for the construction of the hull of any vessel authorized by this act until a contract has been made for the armor of such vessel.

Mr. TILLMAN. I will state that in the event of the adoption of the previous amendment the last provision should go out. It would remain in, however, if the committee amendment as it is printed is retained by the Senate.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, the committee in this amendment has sought to relieve the country from an embarrassment which it feels must be irksome to almost everybody. Right in the midst of our remarkable advance in the construction of naval ships, when we were producing the best naval craft in the world and were armoring the naval craft in the best manner, and were bringing out ships which were the wonder of the naval powers of the earth and a source of pride to the American people, we were at once arrested by the conflict that arose with reference to the cost of the armor plate which must be put upon war ships. The old navy had disappeared; unarmored ships were good for nothing; nobody was building them; if you had ships, you must have armor to make them battle ships. We had been going on and had been paying great prices for armor supplied to the Government, the first armor plant having been erected at the instance of the Government and patronized by it, and the second armor plant also at the instance of the Government and patronized by it, and the Government's armor contracts divided between the two, until at last it was found, in the course of doing this business, that instead of the two armor plants being competitors, with the Government having an advantage, as it had in the building of ships where there was actual competition and very close competition, the two armor plants put their heads together and dictated the prices; and a feeling of natural resentfulness came up with reference to it.

I had that feeling myself, Mr. President. I felt that the Government was being imposed upon; that it ought to get its armor cheaper, and that something should be done. An investigation at the instance of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] was entered into, and it was found that we had been paying \$604 a ton for 1887, \$646 for 1893, \$547 for 1896, \$400 for 1899, \$574 for 1890, \$671 for 1893, \$552 for 1898, \$400 again for 1899, the average being something like \$560 or \$570 per ton. We had been getting good armor. The result of the investigation was that these manufacturers, taken by the throat, as I may say, brought to a consideration of the real question, came down, and they furnished armor for the ships of the 1897 class for \$400, with a royalty of a half a cent a pound, making \$412. That was the best known armor then, the Harvey armor, the armor that had been carbonized. I think if nothing had occurred to change the kind of armor, if improvements had not been made, we should probably have gone on in the ordinary way, appropriating for ships, buying armor at \$400 and a royalty, and that not much question would have arisen as to an armor plant.

But naturally, Mr. President, as it was seen that when we had ships that needed armor these companies demanded higher prices, claiming that they had got a new patent, the Krupp process, and going up from \$400 to \$545, there was again this restiveness in Congress, a feeling that it was too much, that we were being imposed upon. All of us felt that way. Last year the Senate decided, although passing a large programme of new ships, that only \$300 should be paid per ton, and the Department under that—at a later stage of the debate I will put in the letters showing it all—tried to get contracts at \$300 and could not.

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator pardon me a moment if I ask him, in connection with his narration, to state the result of the investigation conducted by the Navy Department in the Fifty-fourth Congress?

Mr. HALE. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] will state that more fully.

Mr. BACON. I thought it would be right in line with the matter about which the Senator is giving information.

Mr. HALE. The general result was that the Secretary of the Navy recommended \$400 as the price.

Mr. BACON. The point to which I wish to direct the Senator's statement is the result of the investigation which, the Senator will remember, was made by certain officers of the Navy, under the direction of the Secretary, as to what was the actual cost.

Mr. HALE. That varied.

Mr. BACON. My recollection is it was about \$300.

Mr. HALE. The Secretary, in summing it up, reckoned that it would not be \$300, but allowing for interest and plant and all that, recommended \$400, for which armor was furnished for one set of ships.

Mr. TILLMAN. If the Senator would like it to go in, I can put it in right here.

Mr. HALE. No; I will let the Senator, for it will be more symmetrical, give it in what he is to say.

I am only going over this briefly to explain this provision of ours and why we put it in. Last year we adopted \$300 per ton and got no bids. At the same time we authorized 3 battle ships, 3 cruisers, and some harbor-defense vessels. We had then behind another 3, the *Maine*, *Missouri*, and *Ohio*, first-class battle ships, with nothing done upon them.

Now, this winter, when the Naval Committee of the Senate met

this question, it found that it had been impossible to get armor for \$300. It found that there were behindhand 5 battle ships, 3 big cruisers, 1 or 2 other smaller vessels; and in addition to that the House had sent us a bill for 2 more battle ships, 3 big armored cruisers, and 3 or 4 protected cruisers, making in all 7 battle ships, 6 cruisers, and 4 protected cruisers, with no provision for armor.

Well, it was an intolerable position, Mr. President. It would make us the laughingstock of the world. Nothing could be brutum fulmen more than, without having armor, to provide for the construction of such a navy as that, for the ships of the three years that are behindhand make a great navy in themselves—7 battle ships, 6 great cruisers, and 4 protected cruisers. It is a greater fleet than will ever be seen together on the waters of the world at any place.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Seventeen in all.

Mr. HALE. Seventeen modern ships, costing in all \$80,000,000, the armor upon which would cost \$35,000,000, and not a particle of provision for armor.

I will tell you, Mr. President, it made the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate sober when it came to consider the subject, and I for one felt and others felt like giving way on some of the things we never believed in. I have never believed in a Government armor plant, but I began to see that unless something was done to hold over the contracting firms who make the armor we would never get any armor, and the committee set itself to devise some plan that would compel good armor to be furnished at a reasonable price by the companies, or to construct a Government plant.

Now, the majority of the committee did and does feel to-day that if this thing can be done, just as ships have been built, by private enterprise, it is very much better than by Government enterprise. I do not belong to the school, the order, of political thought which thinks that everything should be paternal. I belong to the other school. We are apt to be governed too much. Anything that can be done by private enterprise is better done in that way than for the Government to do it. If the ships in our Navy, which have been such successes, had been built in Government yards, they would have cost 40 per cent more, it would have taken 50 per cent more time, and they would not have been as good ships by 30 per cent. We have stimulated and invited the activity and ingenuity of private builders all over the country, and we have got the ships. It is the same about armor. You can get better armor, you can get it quicker; you will have none of the scandals that appertain to governmental establishments that you would have if you turn it over to the Government; and the majority of the committee felt that way; but it also felt that it might come to the point where it would be obliged to have an armor plant.

Now, what have we done? We have looked over all the prices. The price for harveyized armor which we have paid is \$400 per ton, and a half cent per pound, making eleven dollars and a half for the harveyized armor. As to the Krupp armor—and I am not going into the details about that—I am willing to accept the opinion of the world. It is being used by the world to-day. I think it is exaggerated. The extent of superiority that it has over the Harvey armor, I think, is put up. I think the price that these people ask is too much. They undoubtedly pay a royalty. They have to pay that. It is, I believe, a better armor than the harveyed armor—considerably better. But I think they have been making a profit on the Harvey armor. I am willing they should make a fair profit on the Krupp armor. I do not take into account the late experiments as affecting this question in the least. A capped shell will go through 14 inches of Harvey armor. It will go through 8 or 10 or 9 inches of Krupp armor, but we have got to have one or the other or else stop building.

Now, the committee, looking at the cost of harveyed armor that we had paid without protest; looking at the prices that we had paid, at an average of \$575 per ton, in the early years of shipbuilding; looking at the price the companies demand of us, have cast this bill upon this scheme. It is not ours. I am bound to say it is the Vandiver amendment offered in the House, and on a point of order under their rules turned down. The moment I read it I saw the solution. I said, "It is a bright mind that has furnished that solution to this most vexed question which we ought to solve."

That is all there is of it, Mr. President. We said to these armor-plate manufacturers, "You may have these contracts, let by the Navy Department under all the regulations and safeguards that have been thrown about previous contracts, at not \$545, which is not as much as we paid in our first essays at shipbuilding; not \$412, which we paid for harveyed armor; but we will give you not your \$140, \$30 additional, but we will give you twenty-seven or twenty-eight dollars additional for your royalty, and if you will furnish this armor at \$445 you shall have that privilege." The Secretary of the Navy has no power further than that. That is the language.

That in contracts for armor plate for any of the vessels above mentioned—

That is, all of them—

the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to procure armor of the best quality at an average rate not to exceed \$445 per ton of 2,240 pounds, including royalties.

That is a long ton.

If, after due advertisement, the Secretary of the Navy should be unable to contract for such armor designated above, then and in that event the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to procure armor of the best quality for the battle ships *Maine*, *Ohio*, and *Missouri*—

That is the same. There is no question about that—

now awaiting armor, and to pay therefor not to exceed \$545 per ton of 2,240 pounds—

Then afterwards:

Provided further, That if the Secretary of the Navy has found, after such advertisement, that armor plate of the best quality can not be purchased from private manufacturers of armor plate for \$445 per ton of 2,240 pounds, then and in that event he is hereby directed to procure or purchase a suitable site and erect thereon an armor-plate factory at a cost not to exceed \$4,000,000; and to carry out the purposes of this provision the sum of \$2,000,000 is hereby appropriated.

Now, that is what this scheme is. If somebody asks me how I think it will work, I will only say that is conjecture. We have proved that the scheme of the Senator from South Carolina of \$300 a ton will not do. There will be no bids at that. I think the result will be, if we take this proposition and pass it, that when these manufacturers see that if they do not take the \$445 a ton an armor plant will be built, they will take it.

The committee considered what should be its point, and \$445 seemed to be the reasonable point. It is a hundred and odd dollars less than they ask. It is \$130 less than we formerly paid. It is the difference between \$411 and \$445, about thirty three or four dollars, more than what we paid for the harveyed armor. I will tell Senators plainly that is the wit of the project; that it will bring these men to terms.

If I thought, as the Senator from South Carolina does, that the only thing we ought to do in this case is to turn it over to a Government establishment and make our own armor, take all the risk of the cost and delay, I should not accept this proposition of \$445. I would put in, as he does, \$300, which will inevitably bring the armor plant, but I and the committee are not looking to that purpose. We would rather not build a Government armor plant. In the first place, you start a Government armor-plate factory, and under the best conditions you can not get a pound of armor produced under from two to three years; I am inclined to believe four or five. In the meantime, with the exception of the three, the *Maine*, the *Ohio*, and the *Missouri*, all this long line of great ships, added to what we will do next year, and the year after, and the year after that, is simply at a standstill.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Fourteen now.

Mr. HALE. Fourteen now. I do not know when the time will come when we shall stop. We discussed in our committee whether under this condition it would not be better not to provide for any more ships. But the answer was if we did try that we would be beaten in the Senate, as we would. If we had stricken out this programme this year for these ships, with the feeling in the Senate and the feeling of the American people that you must have a great navy, we would have been beaten to death here, and you would have put them on.

Now, we have a project that we think brings out a solution and starts these manufacturers and starts the armor, and it will begin to be supplied within three months, and will go on from year to year. That is our project. In a few words, it is \$445 per ton or an armor plant. We think we have been happy in fixing that limit. Senators who want an armor plant anyway will not vote for this. Some Senators perhaps who think that we ought to give the companies what they ask will not vote that way, and perhaps we will be ground between the upper and nether millstone, as a conservative proposition frequently is. It does not satisfy either side. It does not satisfy the armor-plant men. It does not satisfy the advocates of a Government plant. But it is intended to solve the matter and end it, so that it shall not vex us in the future.

I will not put in any papers which I have. I know the Senator from South Carolina, who is very earnest and very sincere in his view about this matter, desires to develop his side of the case, and I will take no further time of the Senate.

Mr. TELLER. I wish to ask the Senator a question, if he will permit me, before he concludes. The Senator said the committee did not think it was best to have a Government plant. I desire to ask the Senator if he has any idea of the amount of armor plate we are to have in the course, say, of the next ten or fifteen or twenty years; what the policy is going to be; and then I should like to have him state to us why he thinks it is cheaper to buy the plate, or is better—I do not know whether he thinks it is cheaper—from these corporations than it is to build a plant ourselves?

Mr. HALE. I think, as I said in the first place, there will be this delay, which is inevitable. It is all new. It is easy to say build an armor plant. It is not like a pair of shoes or a house or a cart or a bicycle. There is everything else connected with it. There are the ingots, the steel product, all of which are furnished

now by these plants in connection one with the other. I do not think it is to be so greatly expensive as I thought it was at one time. I think it will cost all equipped, ready, not far from \$4,000,000; three to four million dollars.

Now, I do not believe that with governmental methods, with governmental salaries—I am answering the Senator's question now—with governmental labor and yards and establishments, we can begin to manufacture so cheaply as private enterprise. The question is whether we can manufacture it for what they can make it for with their added profit. That is the main question, of course. I will say this about it: I have no idea we can manufacture a ton of this armor in the future at any time with Government methods, Government expenses, everything counted, for \$445.

Mr. STEWART. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. HALE. Yes.

Mr. STEWART. I should like to know if the Senator is of the opinion that these corporations have really taken advantage of the necessity of the Government to charge unreasonable prices?

Mr. HALE. I think they have. There is no doubt about it. I have no doubt about it.

Mr. STEWART. Then I would make a great sacrifice.

Mr. HALE. That has been brought out by the investigation.

Mr. STEWART. I would give them a lesson.

Mr. HALE. They have been getting enormous prices, and we cut them down. This \$445 is \$140 less than we paid year in and year out to these companies.

Mr. STEWART. I understood the Senator to say that the Government assisted both of them to start by patronage, etc., expecting competition?

Mr. HALE. The Government invited them to; I would not say assisted.

Mr. STEWART. I mean assisted by patronage.

Mr. HALE. Well, that is all they had. Senators must remember that these establishments for manufacturing armor do not manufacture anything else. They manufacture for the Government.

Mr. STEWART. The Government made contracts with them?

Mr. HALE. Certainly; and it was done at the suggestion of the Government; there is no doubt about that; and as soon as they got on their feet and understood their power and made their combination, they began to put the knife to us. But I do not want to legislate simply on that. I do not want to legislate *lex talionis*. It never was considered, either by nations or States or men, a good basis for legislation.

Mr. CHANDLER. May I ask the Senator a question right there? Is it really fair to say that it is *lex talionis*?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PETTUS in the chair). The Senator from New Hampshire is out of order.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator from Maine yield to me?

Mr. HALE. I made that remark because the Senator from Nevada—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire must address the Chair.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator addresses the Chair now. The Senator from Maine was speaking then.

Mr. HALE. I did address the Chair long ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is referring to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am now waiting to see if the Senator from Maine will yield.

Mr. HALE. I yield, Mr. President, to the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. CHANDLER. The question I wish to ask the Senator is whether it is fair to say that it is an application of the *lex talionis* simply to build a Government factory and make our own armor. Is that it?

Mr. HALE. In answer to the Senator from New Hampshire, I will say that I made that observation in reply to the remark of the Senator from Nevada. When I had said that these people had put the knife to us when they could, he said, "Very well, now." The idea was to put it to them, to punish them. That was it. Now, I say that is not a good basis for legislation.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. HALE. Yes.

Mr. STEWART. Does the Senator think that the disposition of these corporations is likely to change and that they will not continue to put the knife to us as long as they have the power?

Mr. HALE. No; and that is the reason why the committee has held them right down to \$445. We do not give them a particle of discretion.

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. HALE. We hold them to that and say that if they do not

take that, we will build a Government plant; and if they do not do it, I am decidedly in favor of building it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. HALE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BACON. I wish to ask the Senator a question right in this connection. The Senator previously stated that it has been demonstrated that we could not get any armor at \$300. I understood the Senator to say that. Am I correct?

Mr. HALE. Yes; I think that is true.

Mr. BACON. I will premise the question I wish to ask the Senator with the statement that the present proposition is to offer an alternative, \$445 for armor, to be paid to these manufacturers and, in the event of their refusal to furnish it at that, then the building of a plant by the Government. Now, the question I desire to ask the Senator is whether the demonstration which he said has heretofore been made that we could not get it at \$300 was made with any accompaniment of such an alternative; whether, in other words, we have ever said to these manufacturers, "You must furnish it at \$300, or we will manufacture it for ourselves."

Mr. HALE. No.

Mr. BACON. Is it not true that the proposition made to them to furnish it at \$300 was not accompanied by anything of the kind?

Mr. HALE. So you might go down to \$200 and \$250. The committee—

Mr. BACON. But I understood the Senator to say we had demonstrated it, and I simply wished to suggest the idea that that demonstration can never be made in an effectual way until the same effort to demonstrate it is made at \$300 that the Senator now proposes to make at \$445.

Mr. HALE. There is nobody who believes that they will furnish it for \$300. The \$300 is put in, not with the expectation that it will be taken, but to compel the armor plants. That is the difference between the committee project and the project of the Senator from South Carolina. We do not expect that the offer of \$300 will be taken.

Mr. BACON. I desire to say to the Senator that that is not the view I had of it. While, of course, I defer very perfectly, not only in part but altogether, to the very largely superior judgment and experience of the chairman of the committee, at the same time, having been present at these various discussions, I have formed an opinion myself, based largely upon the report of the naval officers to which I have previously referred, that this armor can be made at a profit at \$300.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, whether, after millions of dollars are put into a plant and a skilled force assembled and everything brought down with the ingenuity of modern mechanism, armor can be produced by the private establishments at a profit at \$300 I do not know. The Senator can not get anything, he does not ride a bicycle, if he rides one, that he does not pay two to one for it. You can not get into a wagon or a cart, you can not buy a suit of clothes, where the element of profit is not large. You can not expect private establishments to furnish to the Government armor at a little profit or at no profit.

But I will not take any more time. I have only shown, I hope, so that Senators may see what this project is. The Senator from South Carolina has the counter project; and the Senate must settle it.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRIS. Before the Senator from South Carolina begins I think the Senate ought to be full, and I therefore suggest the lack of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll. The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allison,	Foster,	McBride,	Sewell,
Bacon,	Frye,	McCumber,	Simon,
Bard,	Gallinger,	McEnery,	Stewart,
Bate,	Gear,	Mallory,	Taliaferro,
Berry,	Hale,	Martin,	Teller,
Burrows,	Hanna,	Nelson,	Thurston,
Caffery,	Harris,	Penrose,	Tillman,
Chandler,	Hawley,	Perkins,	Turley,
Clark, Wyo.	Hoar,	Pettus,	Turner,
Clay,	Jones, Nev.	Platt, Conn.	Vest,
Cockrell,	Kean,	Pritchard,	Wellington.
Daniel,	Kyle,	Quarles,	
Fairbanks,	Lindsay,	Rawlins,	
Foraker,	Lodge,	Ross,	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum being present, the Senator from South Carolina will proceed.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, this matter has been discussed so long and so fully at every session of the Senate since I have been a member that I feel very much out of sorts with the idea of having to discuss it again, because most Senators are familiar with it; and but for the presence among us of some new members, who

of course know little or nothing about it, I would not go into it at any extended length.

The Senate took up the question of the cost of armor under a resolution by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] to investigate in 1896, and we had a thorough and exhaustive investigation of the whole subject. We made our report to the Senate, and on the strength of that report, in spite of the vast power and influence of the Appropriations Committee, which at that time controlled all appropriation bills and were committed to the support of the House bill appropriating \$550 a ton for armor, we struck out that provision and limited the price to \$300.

In the session which began in December, 1897, we did the same thing. In 1898, when the war came on, under the patriotic impulses which governed everyone and threw to the winds any consideration of economy in the completion of ships, we agreed to give the armor manufacturers \$400 a ton for the armor necessary to complete the ships then on the stocks. Last winter we had the same question again before the Senate. The House then, as now, lent itself to advocating and urging excessive prices for armor, and, after a full discussion of the whole question, for the fourth time the Senate again limited the price for armor to \$300 a ton, and prohibited the Secretary of the Navy from making any contracts for the ships ordered under the bill until he could get a contract for armor at \$300 a ton.

The last naval appropriation bill carried with it the largest number of ships of the greatest power and size that we had ever ordered at any one time, the 3 battle ships, the *Georgia*, *New Jersey*, and *Pennsylvania*, which had been named, although they had not been contracted for, and the 3 armored cruisers, *California*, *Nebraska*, and *West Virginia*. These were 6 of the heaviest vessels ever ordered by this Government, involving a cost on each of about \$5,000,000, or in all \$30,000,000, and the armor for them has not been contracted for. Plans have been prepared and are now awaiting the order of Congress on the subject of armor. There were in that same bill 6 cruisers of the second class and 4 monitors for harbor defense, which were contracted for and are now being built. But by reason of the struggle on the part of the Senate to get armor at a fair price there are at this time 14 ships hung up, 8 of which are battle ships, 6 of which are armored cruisers of the first class and 6 cruisers of the second class, and 4 monitors, the last two requiring some of the heaviest and best armor. I say the list I have just enumerated is being hung up and delayed because of the determination of the armor-making concerns of this country to demand, to force upon the Government, a payment in excess of what we have time and again decided was fair and proper, based upon the reports of our own committees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will pause a moment. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 2355) in relation to the suppression of insurrection in, and to the government of, the Philippine Islands, ceded by Spain to the United States by the treaty concluded at Paris on the 10th day of December, 1898.

Mr. SPOONER. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside pending the consideration of the naval appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it will be so ordered. The Senator from South Carolina will proceed.

Mr. TILLMAN. Senators will see that, including the vessels ordered in this bill, we have to-day enough ships which we have either now on the stocks or propose to build, and have appropriated the money for, to require 35,000 tons, or in that neighborhood, and at the prices which the armor trust proposes to make us pay this involves an expenditure of upward of \$17,000,000. Taking the prices which we think would be fair and would give them a large profit, the difference between what they demand and what we believe to be right involves nearly \$8,000,000.

Now, we have had this fight over and over again; and while we have said that \$300 was enough to pay for the armor, we have always been in the unfortunate condition that we have had two or three or five ships ahead that were not completed, for which the armor had not been contracted, and we were appealed to when we came to consider the question, "Do not let us hang up the completion of these vessels; let us give the armor people what they demand, and then we will consider hereafter what we shall do about armor."

The effort to get an armor factory resulted, three years ago, in the appointment of a board of skilled officers by the Navy Department looking to an investigation and a report as to plans and specifications, the cost, location, and everything connected with its construction, and here is the book [exhibiting] with every single, solitary drawing necessary at that time, in the opinion of our engineers, to be put before those who would bid on the project, in order to have them bid intelligently, as to what they would construct an armor factory for.

But the Carnegie and Bethlehem people have been very cunning. They have always kept enough contracts ahead to keep them occupied fully, and waited, hoping that they could get around reducing their prices to a reasonable limit. They have now contracts with the Government which will keep them fully occupied up to the first or the middle of June, and at the same time we have 8 battle ships on the stocks that are ready for their armor and need it.

Now, what is my proposition as contradistinguished from that of the Naval Committee? And I will say that the committee is divided not on party lines, but in party proportions. There is one Republican who stands with us on this proposition, and there is one Democrat who stands with the majority. While this is not a party question, and I shall not discuss it from that standpoint, I want it understood that we are lined up here for the first time almost in opposition to each other. I am very sorry to see the Naval Committee fighting among themselves, because we usually reach such conclusions, when we agree, that the Senate agrees with us.

Mr. HALE. The Senator does not say that the Naval Committee is divided on party lines?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. TILLMAN. No; I said the committee was not divided by party lines.

Mr. HALE. It is not by any means.

Mr. TILLMAN. I have not said that it is.

Mr. HALE. I thought the Senator gave that impression.

Mr. TILLMAN. No; I said we were not divided on party lines.

Mr. HALE. The Naval Committee does not divide in that way.

Mr. TILLMAN. The chairman of the committee, representing the majority of the committee, has pointed out that its policy is to have the Government advertise for bids, offering \$445. My proposition is that we shall offer for bids at \$300 for the armor that we may need until we get our factory. His proposition is that if we can make contracts for the 35,000 tons that we need at \$445, we shall not build an armor factory for the Government. My proposition is that we shall build an armor factory for the Government, no matter what they may offer to furnish armor at. The only difference is that his committee is willing to give \$145 a ton more for the armor than we believe would be just or right or honest, and not build a factory, and leave us at the end of the present contracts in the same condition we are now in—that is, of helplessness and at the mercy of their demands—while I propose to get out of the clutches of these people.

In the first place, Mr. President, to pursue the thought as to why an armor factory is a valuable thing for the Government to own right now, I will call attention to the fact that the capacity of the few armor factories now in this country has been taxed to their utmost for the last three years to supply the demands of the Government, and they have hardly kept pace. If we had continued to build the ships that we ordered, we would be so far behind in being able to obtain armor that there would be great delay.

Next, being at the mercy, by reason of the monopoly which they hold, they say to us, "You must pay us whatever we ask; and if you do not, you shall not build any ships;" and, owing to the length of time which it will take to build a factory, if we were at last to come to a point where we would say, "We will stand this no longer; we will build our own factory and make our own armor," then two years would elapse before we could begin.

If we had ordered the factory at the time when the board was instructed to gather this information, it would now be completed; but instead of doing that we have, since we constituted that board, paid them enough profit over and above what was reasonable and fair to have built two factories with the armor they have furnished us, and now we propose in this bill, if the committee's proposition shall go through, to pay them enough to build two more factories over and above what is a fair price, as will be proven by such witnesses as Hilary A. Herbert and John D. Long, the two Secretaries of the Navy who have had to deal with this subject.

Now, why should the Government own a factory of its own?

First, in order to have a lever by which it can press down or force these people to furnish armor at a decent and fair rate.

Second, because if, in the event of a great war with all of Europe combined or with England alone, it came to be a matter of life and death with this country to have a large navy, two or three times as strong as we now have—and you can all readily see how an emergency of that sort might come about at some time—we would have this factory of our own in reserve, whether we ever built one pound of armor in it or not, to fall back upon to assist these private concerns in turning out armor to help build and equip ships rapidly in case we needed them.

As the question of price is the main one here, I will take that up first. I will go back to the report sent to Congress by the naval committee which examined this subject in 1897. Mr. Herbert was Secretary of the Navy. Now, mind you, he sent naval experts to Europe—two of them—and he sent naval experts to the Carnegie

factory and to the Bethlehem factory. The consensus of the reports of all his experts was to the effect that the material and labor entering into a ton of armor would average about \$196 per ton. Taking this as a basis, the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Herbert, made this calculation:

Labor and material, \$196. He assumes that the plant costing \$1,500,000 would need \$150,000 per year for maintaining it, or \$50 per ton upon 3,000 tons of armor, and adds to the price \$50, making \$246, or, in round numbers, \$250. He then adds for profit 50 per cent, making \$375, and then adds for nickel, to be furnished hereafter by the contractors, \$20, making \$395, and then give them \$5 more for good measure, and makes it \$400.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER], with the natural thrift of a New Englander, did not like that kind of calculating, but still he was very liberal. This is his calculation, based upon practically the same data:

Cost of labor and material per ton, \$168.

Add for reforging, \$12.

Add for maintenance of plant, \$30.

Thirty-three and one-third per cent profit, \$70.

Making \$280.

Add for nickel, \$20.

Making the price for armor \$300 per ton.

Now, Mr. President, if anyone will stop to consider for a moment what an armor factory is, he will know at once that the deterioration in such a plant is practically nothing. The forgings, the machinery, the very nature of the material and of the implements or machinery needed in it being of the very heaviest type, can not deteriorate to any great extent by use. There is a great deal more loss from doing nothing than there is from going on with work.

I read yesterday afternoon a statement from Secretary Long that, according to the very best information he could obtain through his Bureau of Ordnance, the cost of armor was about \$300 a ton. That would mean without allowing anything for the interest on the money. This Government gets money for 3 per cent; and if we choose to add that as a part of the expenses of this investment, it would only amount on a \$4,000,000 investment to \$120,000; but I do not think that ought to cut any figure whatever in considering the necessity and advisability of our having a plant of our own.

I have already pointed out the controlling factors in my mind that compel us, unless we intend to be at the mercy of those people, to have such a plant and to become to that degree independent, that we may demonstrate in our own machine shops what armor will cost. Then, if private parties want to come forward and bid and get a part of the armor under contract to manufacture at anything approximating that price, and we need it, I should be perfectly willing to let them make it in private establishments, and let the armor factory of the Government stand idle if we wish to.

But when Senators tell us, as they do, that with the red tape in the Navy, the eight-hour law, and all the other limitations and obstructions to economical manufacture, you can not make armor in a Government factory as cheaply as you can buy it, my answer is, when I know that I am being robbed, or rather that I am paying an excessive price, when it has been demonstrated time and time again that there are inordinate profits in this business by reason of the monopoly; when I know, according to their own confession, that they are practically united and that they will not bid against each other; when I know, as was proved in our investigation, that the Bethlehem establishment at one time when they had no orders accepted a contract with the Russian Government to furnish them armor at \$240 a ton, my patience becomes threadbare. When I go into a store and buy a thing without knowing its worth, simply paying the price that is asked, I am satisfied; but if a man steps up to me and says, "You must stand and deliver your pocketbook," every instinct of manhood in me revolts and resents any such proceeding. That is exactly the condition in which this Government now stands.

Those people say, "We have a monopoly; nobody else can build armor. There is not only a trust in the United States, but an international trust, so that all other governments pay just what you pay, and you can not help yourselves." I have the documents here and I have the evidence, and if the chairman of the committee, or anyone else, chooses to controvert the statements of fact I am now making as to the condition, I will take great pleasure in reading the testimony that was brought out in the committee to prove what I have asserted as being the condition and the situation. Here is one in regard to the amount of armor; and it is from Mr. Andrew Carnegie. He said:

If the Government would keep us in work, 6,000 tons a year, it would be a highly profitable business.

Mr. STEWART. At what price?

Mr. TILLMAN. At the price then being paid. He said if we would give them a large quantity, they could furnish it more cheaply. In another place Mr. Schwab, the manager of that

concern, made this statement—Mr. Schwab is the superintendent of the Carnegie works:

Quantity and quality are the two essential things in fixing the price of any article. Quantity is, as I have pointed out to you, especially important. We have only made 2,000 tons per year, at the bare cost on 50 per cent higher tonnage. I am prepared to say that if you will give us 3,000 tons of armor per year, as estimated, we will give you a rebate of \$50 per ton upon every ton over that quantity. If you will give us 3,500 tons of armor per year, we will give you a rebate of \$100 per ton for every ton over that quantity.

So, according to their own confession, they have formed a combination and will not bid against each other. They divided the profits and they fixed the price, and we have to pay it.

In this connection I would remind Senators of a little lawsuit that was begun some time ago between Mr. Carnegie and his old friend, Mr. Frick, in which the complaint of Frick sets forth that on one hundred millions of capital, most of which had been the result of profits—because the original capital, I understand, was \$25,000,000—but on one hundred millions they had a profit of \$40,000,000. No wonder they can put up dividends like that, and that Mr. Carnegie can go to Scotland and buy baronies and game preserves and have steam yachts and all that kind of thing. It is a mere question as to whether it is the business of Congress to help him get those inordinate profits out of the pockets of our taxpayers.

There is another aspect of this case—

Mr. KYLE. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question right there?

Mr. TILLMAN. With pleasure; and I will say I should like Senators around me to ask any questions they wish, because I am ready to answer any questions I know anything about, and if I do not know I will frankly tell them so.

Mr. KYLE. I will say to the Senator that I am in favor of the Government owning its own armor plant, but the question occurs to me whether it would be practicable to fix the price at \$300 a ton, considering the advance in the price of labor and the price of iron. I understood that last year, or two years ago, the Government recommended \$400 as the price to be paid these parties for armor.

Mr. TILLMAN. That was at 50 per cent profit, and then they put on about \$30 for odds and ends.

Mr. KYLE. If \$400 was a proper figure then, would \$450 be a proper figure now?

Mr. TILLMAN. We denied that that was the proper figure; the Senate denied it by an emphatic vote, and we limited the price to \$300.

Mr. KYLE. The Senator fixed the figures a year ago at \$300?

Mr. TILLMAN. Yes, \$300.

Mr. KYLE. What, then, would be a proper figure now, considering the advance in the price of material and labor?

Mr. TILLMAN. I will explain to the Senator that the raw product—the base of armor—is steel, or pig iron turned into Bessemer steel. That was then, which was eighteen months ago, about nine or ten dollars a ton. It is now worth about \$17 or possibly \$20 a ton.

There can be no appreciable difference in the cost of the armor from the rise in the price of material, for the reason that the material has not gone up enough to make any appreciable difference, and the rise in wages has not gone to any point which will enable the wage-earner to be benefited by this marvelous prosperity. There has been a slight increase of 5 or 10 per cent. I understand that the skilled labor that is necessary to manufacture armor is employed by the year, so to speak; and that it is paid the very highest price from the beginning; and that there has been no increase in their wages at all. Therefore there is no difference between the existing commercial status or business status and that of a year ago which should cause any difference in the price of armor between then and now.

Mr. KYLE. Not above ten or fifteen dollars a ton?

Mr. TILLMAN. Not above ten or fifteen dollars at any rate; it can not be considered.

Mr. President, we are told that you can not do anything in a Government shop as cheaply as you can have it done in a private shop. If that be true, why have you got the gun works down here at the navy-yard, where we are turning out the best ordnance in the world, and turning it out at a price below what we could buy it for, and where we have the best skilled machinists in the world and the best machinery? Why are we building our artillery for the Army at Watervliet and Watertown, N. Y.? Why do we not buy it all under contract? Here is a shining example of the fact that the Government can build. For building the Congressional Library the estimates were \$5,000,000, and the building was completed and turned over to the Government for \$5,000,000. It is not worth while for Senators to stand up here and put up the argument that you can not afford to have the Government do anything for itself because it will cost so much more money.

That argument can not come from a good many Senators here for the reason that if it did cost more money, that money would go to the labor employed; and there are certain Senators in this Chamber who, in season and out of season, are continually harping upon the theme of the protection of American labor. The

additional cost involved would be that of labor and the additional labor necessary to make good the deficiency on account of the eight-hour law. If Senators are sincere in their expressions of love for the workingman, then there is nothing in the pretense that we should not do this thing in the Government shops for the reason that it would cost more, when that cost would go to pay the man who does the work and sweats over it.

The main contention that influenced me, however, Senators, is that we are being imposed upon by the two firms which we induced—I will not deny that we induced them to go into this business in 1890 or 1888, but we induced them to go into it with this understanding; and it has been proven time and again that we carried out the contract in good faith—that we would give them enough price in excess of what was the cost of making the armor on the first contract to pay for the additional plant necessary; and we have paid for both of the armor factories now in the United States in the first contract, and have continued ever since to give them the same contracts we started out with, or something like that. We have paid for their plants three or four times over, and still they stand here like the daughters of the horse-leech and demand "more, more, more," because we are at their mercy.

Mr. HARRIS. Will the Senator allow me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. TILLMAN. With pleasure.

Mr. HARRIS. I merely want to ask the Senator, before he leaves that branch of the subject, if one of the most vital considerations in favor of having a plant of our own is not the necessity for honest work? Has it not been shown by the investigations which have been made that the Government has been imposed upon in the character of the armor plate furnished to it; and should we not have governmental works for that reason, if not for anything else?

Mr. TILLMAN. I did not propose to touch that subject; but if Senators are curious, if these new members who have not been here long enough to get down to the crust of the thing want to examine the matter, they will find in the report of the House Committee on Naval Affairs in 1894, which was unanimously adopted by the House and sent here to be agreed to by the Senate, and which was buried in the committee here, that it was proven by the confession of Carnegie's own superintendent and the employees who were trusted by him in the manufacture of armor that he had put upon our vessels and foisted off on our Government at least 50 or 100 plates that were plugged up, that had blow-holes and spongy places in them, and did not conform to the requirements of the contract. Here is the proof and the evidence of it. If any Senator wants to examine it, it is accessible. Of course I do not suppose we are getting any dishonest armor these days.

The only other point that I will discuss now, and I will do that very briefly, is the revelation—

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. TILLMAN. I do.

Mr. CHANDLER. I would ask the Senator if he would not prefer to have an audience of Senators when he speaks?

Mr. TILLMAN. I take it for granted one of two things must be true—that either those Senators who are not here are all going to vote with the Senator from New Hampshire and myself, and so do not want to hear any more upon the subject—and if they would indicate that I should very gladly stop—or else they have made up their minds that they are going to swallow this thing, it does not matter how nauseating it may be, simply because the committee have recommended it.

Mr. CHANDLER. Perhaps if the Senator would suspend, he might get his amendment adopted right away.

Mr. TILLMAN. There will be a yea-and-nay vote called on the adoption of the amendment, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. CHANDLER. I suggest the absence of a quorum, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum being suggested, the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll; and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allison,	Elkins,	Hoar,	Perkins,
Bard,	Fairbanks,	Jones, Nev.	Pettus,
Bate,	Foraker,	Kean,	Platt, Conn.
Berry,	Foster,	Kyle,	Quarles,
Burrows,	Frye,	Lodge,	Ross,
Caffery,	Gallinger,	McEnery,	Simon,
Chandler,	Hale,	Mallory,	Teller,
Clark, Wyo.	Hanna,	Martin,	Thurston,
Clay,	Hansbrough,	Money,	Tillman,
Cockrell,	Harris,	Nelson,	Turley,
Daniel,	Hawley,	Penrose,	Wellington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the roll call 44 Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is therefore present. The Senator from South Carolina will proceed.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I beg to inform those Senators

who have just been called from more agreeable occupations that it was against my wish that they should be disturbed. They either have made up their minds on this subject or they do not want to hear anything about it, and I would not like to intrude on them. I am not complaining at all.

Mr. WELLINGTON. Will the Senator allow me for a moment?

Mr. TILLMAN. With pleasure.

Mr. WELLINGTON. I think the Senator is not entirely fair to some Senators here who are continuously called out on business by their constituents.

Mr. TILLMAN. I did not intend to reflect on any Senator. This is a free and easy body, and each man has a right to do as he pleases. I am not complaining that Senators do not listen to me. I did not bring them in; I did not ask to have it done, and I would have been glad if it had not been done.

Mr. WELLINGTON. The Senator intimates that it was necessarily one thing or the other.

Mr. TILLMAN. Well, then, I take back what I said. I do not want to reflect on any Senator who was unavoidably absent.

I stated a little while ago the fact that we had put up these plants and given them to these people in the original contracts. I will give Mr. Herbert's testimony on that point, and he has investigated it very fully:

Secretary HERBERT. The method by which I arrived at these results was as follows. This table shows—

I will say here that we asked these gentlemen to show us their books, to let us investigate by their own books and records as to the cost of this stuff, and we told them we would allow them whatever was shown to be the cost and a fair and liberal profit in addition, but they would not do it.

Here is what Mr. Herbert says:

The method by which I arrived at this result was as follows: This table shows the gross earnings and the net earnings. I got from the Navy and War Departments what the Government paid the company for gun steel and for armor. Those amounts showed, when compared with the amount of gross receipts, which represented the volume of all their business from all their plants, the relative sums that were paid by the Government and received from their commercial plant.

I allowed the stockholders, in the first place, 10 per cent on their original investment of \$2,000,000, and 10 per cent on their new stock from the dates when investments were severally made, not taking into account the other million which appeared as a stock dividend, and then took the balance of net receipts, and these eliminated all the new stock. It paid them 10 per cent upon the original stock of the company as it was before it had Government work, eliminated their new stock after having paid till its extinguishment 22 per cent upon it, and then the remainder was more than enough to pay their indebtedness.

Senator TILLMAN. Enough for the Government to pay for the plant and give it to them?

Secretary HERBERT. The Government has, according to my estimates, paid for the plant, and they have the plant now; if these calculations are correct, and there is a large balance over.

That was six years ago. I said also a moment ago that these people did not pretend to compete with each other. Here is the testimony of Mr. Schwab, the superintendent of the Carnegie works:

Senator BLACKBURN. Is there any competition in the price of armor in this country as between yourselves and the Bethlehem Company?

Mr. SCHWAB. No, sir; assuredly not. We have always had an understanding in that matter. We never take a contract that we do not consult with Bethlehem about it.

Senator BLACKBURN. I asked if there is competition?

Mr. SCHWAB. No, sir; there is no competition. I want to be quite fair on that point.

And Senators who do not want to build an armor factory for the Government will continue this process of giving these people enough to build a new factory in this very contract which we are now about to let for 32,000 or 35,000 tons of armor. There is enough money involved of clear net profit over and above what we have demonstrated is a fair price to build two factories of the most approved kind and the best in the world.

I have only one other feature to discuss, and I will do that very briefly, and that is in reference to the recent disclosures as to the penetrability of Krupp armor. When I have demonstrated that point to the satisfaction of the Senate, that we had held off building ships and contracting for armor so that these people had to come down from \$550, which they had been charging, to something inside of reason, they said that they could not take \$400 a ton for the armor for the three battle ships which were then on the stocks. But they did take it. They wrote letters declaring that they could not afford to make the armor at that price; but they did come down and take it.

Since then, two years ago, the Krupp process has been discovered. It was exploited as a very extraordinary improvement in armor, although we have here the statements of Secretary Long and Admiral O'Neil before the Naval Committee eighteen months ago that at that time they did not believe it was of enough importance to cause us to delay making contracts for harveyized armor with the Bethlehem people at the price which we were willing to give when the war was coming on, at \$400 a ton. But when they began to claim that Krupp armor was so much better, so much superior to Harvey armor, and we could not afford to have any but the best armor, these people went back to \$445 a ton. I have never been satisfied in my own mind that there has not been

some hocus-pocus by which this Government was sought to be cheated under the pretense that Krupp armor was better, when, in fact, it was not one whit better than the Harvey armor.

What do these penetrations of 9-inch armor by 6-inch shells show? If the Krupp armor is better, we do not know it. The shell penetrates both, it is true, and yesterday the Navy Department hurried off down to Indian Head with orders to put up a 14-inch harveyized plate, and they penetrated that, we are told in this morning's paper, with the same shell which penetrated the 9-inch Krupp; but they have not demonstrated that if a 14-inch Krupp plate were subjected to the same test it would not be penetrated, too. Have we not the testimony of the chairman of the Naval Committee that those shells would penetrate any armor that is made? What, then, is the difference between our buying Krupp armor and Harvey armor, if both are penetrable and neither will protect our battle ships? Then who is willing to pay the additional price of \$545, over \$100 more than what we think and what has been testified to here is a fair price, a reasonable price, for this Government to pay for armor that is no better than the other?

Senators will say in that event, Then why buy any armor? The chairman of the Naval Committee, if I do not misstate his position, is indifferent in some measure as to whether we build any more battle ships until the question of armor is settled. For my part I do not want to stop increasing the Navy. Whether Krupp armor is better than Harvey armor or not, either is as good as any other nation has, and I want a sufficiency of naval vessels of the best type to keep us abreast of our competitors.

I do not like to lug in the imperialism that my friend the Senator from New Hampshire brought in this morning, but with our new programme of contest which is on we shall certainly in the near future need a big navy, much larger than we have now. We have ordered the ships. The only question is what armor shall we put on and where is it to come from. I say I want the ships, and I am ready to do anything reasonable to get the armor to put on the ships, and I want good armor, but I do not want to have people stand up and tell me that Krupp armor is any better than Harvey armor when there is no proof to that effect.

Mr. ALLISON. I desire to ask the Senator whether or not this bill does not contemplate the use of Krupp armor exclusively?

Mr. TILLMAN. The bill is ambiguous to the point that it provides for the armor of the best manufacture.

Mr. CHANDLER. The best quality.

Mr. TILLMAN. The best quality. The question is, What is the best quality?

Mr. ALLISON. That settles that question.

Mr. HALE. Is not that the language which has been in the bill for years?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine must observe the rule.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I beg pardon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. TILLMAN. With pleasure.

Mr. HALE. I ask the Senator if that is not the language we have used in these bills for years?

Mr. TILLMAN. I think that is the language which has been used in these bills for years. That proves nothing other than that the Ordnance Bureau, which has this matter in charge, is supposed to make such tests as will prove to its satisfaction what is the best armor.

Mr. ALLISON. I desire to ask the Senator from South Carolina whether or not these tests, the very tests we have reported on here, do not disclose that Krupp armor of 9 inches in thickness is about equal to 14 inches of Harvey armor?

Mr. TILLMAN. It does not. It discloses nothing of the kind.

Mr. ALLISON. Then I misunderstood entirely the Senator from Maine this morning, the chairman of the committee.

Mr. TILLMAN. I do not want to cast any reflection on the Navy Department—

Mr. ALLISON. I certainly do not.

Mr. TILLMAN. And I do not want to appear in the attitude of charging collusion between the armor factories and the Ordnance Bureau, but I do not propose to take any such testimony as that as proving any such thing. In view of the haste with which this new test of shooting at a 14-inch Harvey plate with a 6-inch capped shell and penetrating it was rushed into the papers this morning, without it being accompanied by the statement that a 14-inch Krupp plate had been tested at the same time with the same gun, with the same charge, I say nothing has been proved.

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. TILLMAN. With pleasure.

Mr. HALE. The only significance which these late experiments about armor have is that the best projectile will pierce any armor. I want to say to the Senate that I look upon it as entirely demonstrated by the experiments made by the Navy Department and referred to in their reports, which I will have read later, that the Krupp armor has an impenetrability at least 25 per cent beyond the Harvey.

Mr. ALLISON. May I interrupt the Senator from South Carolina for a moment?

Mr. TILLMAN. Certainly.

Mr. ALLISON. I find in this document, which was laid upon our tables this morning, a statement of the Navy Department that certain projectiles have a muzzle energy of 46,246 foot-tons, "with the power to perforate (with capped projectiles) 19½ inches of harveyized or 15½ inches of Krupp armor." What does that mean?

Mr. TILLMAN. I suppose it means what it purports to say; but do you believe it?

Mr. ALLISON. Does not that disclose that the Krupp armor is better armor than the Harvey armor?

Mr. TILLMAN. Everything depends entirely on the way the tests were made, on the amount of powder and the quality of the powder, on the initial velocity, and all those things; and I say we have had no comparative test, side by side, on the same day, of these two armors which has demonstrated any such thing.

Mr. MONEY. Will the Senator from South Carolina permit me?

Mr. TILLMAN. Certainly.

Mr. MONEY. What becomes of the statement which has been sent to us officially by the Department that the test was made with the same initial velocity, the same foot-tons' energy, upon the two armor plates, one of 19½ and the other of 15½ inches, with the same result? Now, this is an official statement.

Mr. TILLMAN. When we recall the fact that a resolution was passed by the Senate calling for information in regard to tests of Krupp armor and the information was refused; when it was told to members of the Senate that they could not send us that report; when on the heels of that the substance of that report got into the papers this morning; when it was known that the shell—a 6-inch shell—had penetrated 9 inches of Krupp armor and had never been shot at anything thicker; when on the heels of that there was a rush down to Indian Head to test a 14-inch Harvey plate, which they have tested and tested and tested in the past and ought to have been satisfied about; when that appears in the papers this morning as a reason why the Krupp armor is better than the Harvey armor, I say I am allowed to have suspicions, and I have got them and I can not help it.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. TILLMAN. With pleasure.

Mr. HALE. I told the Senator the other day, when he was making a statement full of suspicion of everybody, that he must not ever come to the pass where he would refuse to eat his dinner because he was afraid his cook would poison him.

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator is always making very wise statements, and that is one of the wittiest and wisest I have ever heard from him.

Mr. HALE. The Senator must not assume that that which is done in the ordinary course of a department is done for a covert purpose. The experiments which were made yesterday were made, I fancy, because I suggested to the Secretary that if there were any further experiments that he could make which would throw any light on the subject of armor plate and its penetrability, I wished that he would make them as soon as possible. Whatever was done yesterday was not done to establish any theory, to help the Senator or to help me, but it was done to bring light. It did not bring very much light.

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator from Maine on the strength of it declares that 9 inches of Krupp is about equal to 14 inches of harveyed, without a scintilla of proof.

Mr. HALE. I have the reports of the Department, which I will put in before we get through, showing precisely that, showing that, so far as impenetrability goes, the Krupp armor is better than the Harvey armor by a large percentage, 25 per cent, but that neither is impenetrable. Now, before yesterday an 11-inch Harvey plate had been penetrated by a capped projectile as though it were pine wood.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Some time ago.

Mr. HALE. And that not lately, time and time again. Anything that was done yesterday was only in demonstration of what could be done by the projectile.

If I may be allowed by the Senator, the infirmity in his position is that he is seeking to get advantage for his proposition of a Government armor-plate plant, because these experiments have shown that the Krupp armor can be pierced. It has nothing to do with it. I think the Senator must see that it has nothing to do with that. This piercing of Krupp armor is not a new thing. The Senator is not surprised at it?

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator from Maine please tell me whether any 14-inch Krupp armor has ever been made or tested?

Mr. HALE. Fourteen-inch armor?

Mr. TILLMAN. Fourteen-inch Krupp armor.

Mr. HALE. Fourteen-inch armor is not put upon a ship by any power. It is only experimental.

Mr. TILLMAN. We have the *Indiana*, which is armored with 14 or 16 inch armor.

Mr. HALE. Harvey armor.

Mr. TILLMAN. But 16 inches.

Mr. MONEY. Will the Senator from South Carolina permit me?

Mr. TILLMAN. I will.

Mr. MONEY. The official statement is that the test was made upon 15½ inches of Krupp armor at a distance of 3,000 yards, with a muzzle energy of 46,246 foot-tons and an initial velocity of 2,800 foot-seconds, and at the same time the experiment was made with 19½ inches of harveyed armor with the same result.

Mr. CHANDLER. What was the result?

Mr. HALE. About 25 per cent difference.

Mr. CHANDLER. Where is the statement?

Mr. ALLISON. Page 2.

Mr. CHANDLER. I desire to address the Senate—

Mr. TILLMAN. They say so; that is theoretical.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. TILLMAN. With pleasure.

Mr. CHANDLER. I was about to state what the Senator from South Carolina, I believe, intended to say, that most of these statements as to the strength of armor in these tables are calculations.

Mr. TILLMAN. This is a calculation pure and simple. It is not any experiment.

Mr. CHANDLER. They are calculations made from experiments which have been made. Take the tables on pages 15 and 16. Those tables probably have been made up from one or two or three actual experiments—

Mr. HALE. In Document No. 10.

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes; and the calculations are made from those. The statement on page 2 of Document No. 341, which the Senator from Iowa reads, does not say that these things have been done, and I do not believe they have been done. I think it is a calculation made from firing at a thinner plate. There is no statement there that a 19½-inch Harvey plate has been perforated or that a 15½-inch Krupp plate has been perforated at these distances. It is a calculation of the Department that by reason of tests made on other pieces of armor that would be the result.

Mr. ALLISON. May I interrupt the Senator from South Carolina for a moment simply to ask the Senator from New Hampshire a question?

Mr. TILLMAN. With pleasure.

Mr. ALLISON. Are these calculations of no value or are they considered of value by people who understand the question of tests?

Mr. CHANDLER. They are of some value, but it is always well to know whether it is a calculation made from a particular experiment or whether it is the result of an actual experiment. I say in this case it is a calculation made from experiments; and as the Senator from Iowa stated it to the Senate as if these tests had actually been made, I wanted to call attention to the fact that they undoubtedly had not been made. It is a calculation.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. TILLMAN. With pleasure.

Mr. HALE. If the Senator will examine this document—

Mr. CHANDLER. Which one?

Mr. HALE. Senate Document No. 10, on the armor question, and will begin at page 13, under the head "Superiority of armor made by the Krupp process," and will follow through what is stated there, he will find demonstration of the comparative superiority of the Krupp armor, not its impenetrability, I repeat, but its comparative superiority over any other armor.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I have very little more to say. The point with me is that it is not going to cost this Government anything that is worthy of consideration if we spend \$4,000,000 to get an armor factory and settle this question. The very fact that a great many of us feel and believe—and a majority of the Senate from their votes in the past so feel—that the Government has been imposed upon; that these people were unreasonable, and that after we have paid for their plants and given them to them and paid for them again and given them to them they still continue to demand of us these high prices, ought to appeal to every Senator to relieve this Government from any such condition of helplessness to be imposed upon.

We are investing money by the million here and there and everywhere else in fortifications; we are laying up stores, munitions of war, powder and shells, and building artillery, and all that kind of thing, costing in the millions. Why is this proposition to have an armor factory to demonstrate whether or not the Government can make its own armor cheaper than it is buying it, fought so bitterly? Why is the effort to get this Government out from under the clutches of these two factories fought so desperately? What is there behind it all? Why are we called on here,

year after year, to fight over this same old matter and not settle it once for all, at least to the point of determining in the future intelligently in our own factory what the real cost of armor is and, at the same time, have a laboratory where we can test and improve and experiment, at whatever cost may be necessary, to get the very best armor possible—something that will be better than Krupp.

Mr. HALE. I will tell you why it is being fought. It is because honest men in the Senate—

Mr. TILLMAN. I am not imputing any dishonesty to any Senator in his vote. I believe Senators are going to vote with the committee because of their respect for the committee, without having investigated the matter or caring anything about it, or else they are going to vote honestly; and, thank God, hitherto we have always had enough on our side to win out.

Mr. HALE. The Senator must not surcharge his atmosphere too much with suspicion. I was going to give the reason why it is fought. It is because honest men in the Senate believe that this introduction of the feature of paternalism, of the Government doing everything and owning everything and working everything, will be a dangerous thing in the Navy Department; that there should be no such departure; and we think that we have got here a bill that gives a fair price and a fair profit and good armor to the Government without its resorting to the dangerous experiment of an armor plant of its own. That is the reason.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator allow me right here?

Mr. HALE. Yes.

Mr. TILLMAN. How long will it be, if the armor factories accept this proposition of \$445 a ton, after having almost sworn that they could not afford to do it, as they did when they came to the \$400 limit on Harvey armor, before some other hocus-pocus, some new pattern, somebody else's armor will be brought forward as an excuse for raising the price back to its present rates?

Mr. HALE. Never, Mr. President.

Mr. TILLMAN. Ah!

Mr. HALE. Never. When it is seen how successful has been this effort to restrain and control these corporations, and that they have been obliged to come to our terms and to furnish armor at reasonable rates, never again will they dare set up rebellion. If they do, we will give them an armor plant.

Mr. TILLMAN. Oh, yes; the same old fight will come along. Here is another aspect of this case. In the event of a war involving the very life of this Republic, or at least entailing upon it the necessity of exerting all its great energies, where would you be if these people are left simply to their own greed and you had nothing to fall back upon?

Mr. HALE. You can provide beforehand for war. You can get your establishment. You can never get your navy. You can not in case of war, with or without an armor plant, improvise a navy. That is different from an army. You can summon men, you can provide for the order and array of regiments, and can have an immense force in a short time, but it makes no difference in war whether you have or do not have an armor plant—not the least.

Mr. TILLMAN. Does the Senator acknowledge that there might not arise a contingency where this Government would be at war for six or eight years and have to exert itself to its utmost, like a giant, to prepare to overthrow its enemy?

Mr. HALE. There has not been a modern war that lasted six or seven or eight years, and there never will be. It will be a question of the preparedness of the nation at the moment when war is declared and the clash of arms comes. There will never be a war of years and years duration. It will all be settled sharp and quick.

Mr. TILLMAN. That might apply as between nations on the Continent of Europe, where they can get at each other's throat, but look at us, isolated here, occupying this continent, so to speak, and with the ocean between us. Suppose a struggle were to come for the mastery of the world, and some Senators dream of having such a struggle in the near future. I do not hope so; I hope to God no such struggle will come; but I say I see whether the policy inaugurated will lead; and what condition will you be in when such a struggle arises to enlarge your Navy so as to equal that of any other nation? What is \$4,000,000 to the people of the United States to get out of the clutches of a monopoly?

The Senator talks to us about paternalism. Is it paternalism for the Government to manufacture its own guns at the navy-yard here?

Mr. HALE. We only finish them.

Mr. TILLMAN. Well, Mr. President, let us finish the battle ships.

Mr. HALE. We have never, and it has been good policy, undertaken to lay the foundation and to build the guns from the bottom. We have left that, as we have the building of ships, to private enterprise. The Senator, with his line of thought and education, does not seem to realize the tremendous force of the Government encouraging private establishments to do everything.

It is what has built up the Navy. It is what has built up these establishments. It has built up everything. It is private establishments.

Mr. TILLMAN. It is nothing but another form, so to speak, of the subsidy that is proposed now to restore our merchant marine. We are proposed to be milked. The Government cow must be milked for the favored few. The corporations that are already multi-millionaires must be allowed to suck the sweet milk of taxes, while the people are told it is paternalism.

Mr. HALE. The great establishments in this country which, to the wonder of the world, have been builded up in the last ten years are none of them millionaire establishments.

Mr. TILLMAN. Carnegie, one of the favorites of this combination, as I have just pointed out—I do not think the Senator was in the Chamber—in his little lawsuit with Mr. Frick, disclosed the fact that with a hundred million dollars capital they had \$40,000,000 of something to divide. I do not know whether it was swag or not. Somebody had been held up and made to yield exorbitant profits to the millionaires.

Mr. HALE. I do not know why the Senator has gone outside into other questions; but so far as Mr. Carnegie and his establishment go, the armor-producing plant of the Carnegie establishment is a bagatelle.

Mr. TILLMAN. Then it is a bagatelle to the United States, certainly.

Mr. HALE. It is nothing; it is simply a development in one branch of a great industry. What we are seeking to do, what I believe in doing, and what the Senate some time or other has to assert itself on very squarely, if it has not already, is a tendency toward paternalism in everything, that the Government shall reach out, shall absorb, shall control, shall manufacture, and do everything that ought to be done by private enterprise.

Mr. TILLMAN. Why is the Senator discriminating as to these things? You have got the Government Printing Office here. You do not hire your printing done outside, although you know you could have it done more cheaply outside.

Mr. HALE. I have had some experience on that committee. I have been chairman of the Committee on Printing. It costs the Government to-day 50 per cent more—

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator knows why.

Mr. HALE. To do its printing than it would if it were done by contract.

Mr. TILLMAN. I said the Senator knows why. Why do you not change that?

Mr. HALE. Why do we not change it? We can not change it. If the Senator ever got his armor plant, you never would change it.

Mr. TILLMAN. You mean we never could go back to Carnegie and Bethlehem?

Mr. HALE. Never.

Mr. TILLMAN. Thank God if we never did. I would be willing for the laborers to reap the additional profits instead of the Bethlehem and the Carnegie company heaping up their millions.

Mr. HALE. Every experiment made of the Government embarking in an enterprise that is in the fair field of private industry shows but one unerring result—additional cost.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. TILLMAN. I do.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, I admire the zeal and the motive which have impelled my friend the Senator from South Carolina to take the position he has in relation to the Government erecting an armor plant of its own. I have been upon the committee that has had this subject-matter under consideration for many days and many weeks, and we have all been on the same line of thought, but have arrived at different conclusions.

If I could believe with my friend that it is practicable for the Government to build an armor-plate plant and manufacture this armor plate for the figures he named, or 10 or 20 per cent more, I should not hesitate for one moment to unite my vote with his own for his proposed amendment. But the testimony before your committee, which was not controverted, was that there is not one of these manufacturers engaged in the manufacture of armor plate where it is not a mere incident to their other general business.

If the Government establishes its armor-plate factory, it must then go to the mines for the iron ore, it must bring it to its furnaces, must smelt it, must run it into pig iron, and then the pig iron must be run into ingots of steel by the Bessemer or some other process. It was shown to your committee that from every ingot of steel, when it has come out of the furnace and is ready for the test, 10 per cent is taken off each end, not suitable to go into an armor plate. Your committee believed, after considering all these facts, that it would cost the Government to manufacture armor plate a larger sum than \$445 per ton, when you consider the royalty, when you consider the cost of the nickel that is placed in it for harveyizing and other processes.

I do not share with my friend the Senator from Maine the fear

of a paternal form of government. All source of power is lodged in the people, and the people will correct any wrong. I will join hands with my friend the Senator from South Carolina in enacting a law that will enable us to build a cruiser, a battle ship of the line, or some other vessel of war in each navy-yard of the United States to-day. That is a practical question that we can take hold of and handle, but this armor-plate question is a different proposition.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. PERKINS. In one moment. I agree with the Senator from Maine that this amendment, which was not, as he has frankly stated, the creation of the committee in the Senate, but was offered in the other branch of Congress by the minority who had favored the establishment of an armor-plate factory, was adroitly drawn. It is a wise measure, and I am in favor of it, because it says to these monopolies (and the question has been well asked, What is stronger than a million dollars except two million dollars?) "We will make your plant worthless if you do not accept what is a fair price for armor plate."

Now, in brief, these are the motives that influenced me in voting with the majority of the committee.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, the Senator has put into my speech (although I was about through, but I had not quite summed up) a very nice little speech of his own that really contradicts itself.

Mr. PERKINS. Then it brings out my friend's own speech.

Mr. TILLMAN. How can the Senator explain to his constituents that it is a proper thing for the Government to build a navy-yard and equip it and employ mechanics and construct an entire vessel when it is not the proper thing for the Government to build an armor-plate factory, to employ mechanics, and construct the armor to go on that vessel?

Mr. PERKINS. Several very excellent answers suggest themselves to me in reply to my friend. The first proposition is that we have the navy-yards, we have the machine shops, and we have all the appliances for building vessels in the respective navy-yards; but the manufacture of armor plate is a special business in itself. There is, aside from the trade secrets, a patent which this Government does not own and royalties to be paid for its use.

Mr. TILLMAN. Right there let me say that the Senator is in error. There is not a patent on the Krupp process, and there is no royalty to be paid on it. We have Mr. O'Neil's testimony to show it.

Mr. QUARLES. Is that the case with the harveyed armor?

Mr. TILLMAN. It is the case with the harveyed armor also.

Mr. PERKINS. The Schneider Company, of southern France, claim that they have a patent upon the harveyized process. The Armstrong Company and the Krupp Company claim that any manufacture of their armor plate by what is known as the Krupp process is an infringement upon their right. We all know that if the Government uses any particular process or trade secret, we shall have a claim here against this Government for it.

But I want to answer the Senator further to show why I am not inconsistent in advocating the building of vessels in our navy-yards. We have there all the appliances for building vessels. I am not in favor of manufacturing armor plate in a factory erected and owned by the Government. It was in evidence before your committee that one of these great manufacturing companies purchased a trip hammer that cost a half a million dollars, and they found it impracticable, and it was abandoned and thrown away.

Mr. TILLMAN. The United States in buying armor have paid for that hammer ten times.

Mr. PERKINS. I want my friend to follow on this same line of thought. While I have asked him a long question, perhaps, I want him to demonstrate (and if he will do it to my satisfaction, he will have my vote) that the Government can erect an armor-plate factory and can manufacture armor even at 10 per cent more than what is proposed to be paid in this bill. I do not believe that any private company could start a new armor factory with only one customer, the Government of the United States, and manufacture it at \$445, the figure which your Committee on Naval Affairs have agreed to recommend shall be paid.

Mr. TILLMAN. I will answer that right now by quoting in Senate Document No. 127, second session Fifty-fifth Congress, from an examination before the Naval Committee of the Secretary of the Navy. The chairman asked the Secretary the following question:

Have you, from your examination of the question or from the report of the board which you appointed on Government plant, any views that you care to express to the committee as to the cost to the Government of such armor plate as this, compared with the \$400 per ton for which you think you could make a contract with the companies?

Senator McMILLAN. Do you mean by that the cost of making the armor plate by the Government plant?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, sir.

Secretary LONG. I can only say at second hand what has been suggested to me by the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance. He has made some inquiries, and if I do not quote him correctly he will inform me.

Admiral O'Neil was sitting there.

I think he finds that if the Government should establish this plant, as recommended, it would make armor plate for something less than \$300 a ton.

Here is a report of the board with all the plans and specifications and the estimate of cost, and the estimate of cost is less than \$3,000,000.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, my attention was attracted by the statement made by the Senator from South Carolina that there were no patents on either the Harvey or the Krupp method of manufacturing armor plate. Is the Senator quite positive on that point?

Mr. TILLMAN. I think this same document here from the Department states—

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will allow me, of course, in the first place, I disclaim any personal knowledge about the matter at all; but a letter came into my hands a little time ago, written from Carlsbad, November 22, 1899, from which I want to read a paragraph:

The Krupp invention is part patented and part secret. It is owned for the world (except Germany, where it is owned by Krupp) by the Harvey Continental Steel Company, Limited (an English corporation). That company has licensed all the principal armor manufacturers of Europe, and has also licensed the Carnegie and Bethlehem companies in the United States. If the United States Government wants Krupp plates, they, of course, can get them of the Carnegie and Bethlehem companies, but obviously not at the price of Harvey plates, because, first, Krupp plates are much more expensive to manufacture and, second, the licensees have to pay a considerable royalty per ton for the right to manufacture.

I will say to the Senator, while I do not care to give this gentleman's name, that he has a very intimate knowledge of the manufacture of armor plates.

Mr. TILLMAN. In that regard I quote here a statement from Captain O'Neil before the Naval Committee, made at the time I have just mentioned, November, 1898.

It—

The Krupp process—

is not patented, and is simply a secret. Mr. Krupp's conditions were that it should be held a secret. They do not think they will be able to manufacture this armor yet.

He means by "they" the Bethlehem and Carnegie companies.

They have sent their men abroad and brought them back, and are making experiments now with a view of submitting some plates.

In another place, on which I can not put my hand, because these reports come in so multitudinously it is very difficult for a man to keep up with them, Mr. O'Neil states that it is not a patented process or a secret process, and that if it were the Government could get it at very little cost, and that it therefore has no bar to our using it in case we find it is better. I deny that it is any better than our armor.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator allow me to make a statement in connection with the question which my colleague asked?

Mr. TILLMAN. Certainly.

Mr. CHANDLER. There is no doubt at all that in connection with the Krupp process the companies possessing that trade secret, as they call it, for which they ask these royalties, have acquired the Harvey patent. The Harvey patent was in litigation in this country. There is grave doubt about whether they are sound patents, but such as they are they have been acquired by the companies that own the Krupp process. I think that the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance believes that we could have an armor plant and manufacture armor ourselves without infringing upon any existing patents.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, we would spend a large amount of money if a foreign power undertook to have control of the construction of our ships. We should be absolutely free to construct ships as we choose and not let the veto power be in private corporation. It is a very important matter. We are liable to have foreign wars and we will need a good many ships. If armor plate is an essential and a corporation has the control of the manufacture, and has shown bad faith already, and it holds that over the Government of the United States, I think the first thing we should do is to spend enough money to break that corner, as it is sometimes called, or that Gordian knot. Whether we ever manufacture any armor or not at our own factory, we do not want to be building a navy with a rod held over us by an unscrupulous corporation.

It appears to be the concurrent opinion on all hands that they have acted very badly. In the case of an emergency we must have armor. Every year we are making provision by law for the construction of more vessels and the demand for armor is increasing. It will take time to build this factory. It might have been built now if on the first appearance of this robbery, when they first held the Government by the throat, we had commenced to build the factory. It will take years to do it. The fact that we have no such plant is held over us now, and if you do not let us go on with it, it will take years to place us in an independent position. I want to be independent in what we do. I do not care what you pay them now, but let us have an end of it, and there is no way to put an end to it except to build a factory.

There ought not to be any "ifs" in this bill. This amendment

should not make the building of the factory contingent upon the private establishments supplying armor temporarily at \$400 a ton. I would be willing to pay them anything until we get through with them, just as you pay a robber to get him away, but you do not want to put yourself under obligations to him. When you pay him a bounty, you want him to take his pistol down and go off. I want them to take the pistol down. I do not want them to hold their pistol over us. I would not have any "ifs" in the provision. I would make the appropriation, and I would pay them now whatever I thought was absolutely necessary in order to get along. I would submit to the robbery now, but I would commence immediately to free the Government from it. I think it is a shame. The building of our Navy has been greatly delayed, and this question has come up every year for the last three or four years. I think it is time that we put an end to it. If it is true, as is admitted by their best friends, that they have the Government by the throat and intend to make the most of it and to ask unreasonable prices, there is no way to get along with this monopoly except to build an establishment.

With the four millions that we have spent for armor we could have established a plant of our own. But let us pay them off and then we shall know whether we can ever have a navy or not. I am glad to believe, though my belief is not worth much, that armor plate will in some near day in the future be discarded altogether.

Mr. TELLER. What will take its place?

Mr. STEWART. Fast ships, high speed, and effective guns. I believe they are worth more than armor. As far as I can observe, in the recent war speed was the great factor. I believe the *Oregon* in the battle of Santiago would have been worth very little if it had not had great speed. In every contest you find great speed a very important element. The heavy armored battle ships can not have the same speed that lighter vessels have. If we had had at Santiago nothing but wooden vessels with superior guns and great speed we could have handled that situation very easily. They hit our ships very few times, comparatively, because they could not come up to them. When they are cruising around along the coast here the question of speed is the final one. The highest speed and the best guns, I think, are going to be the leading necessity.

But it is assumed now that armor plate is a necessity. That may be true, and that may continue to be the case. But assuming that armor plate is a necessity, and that that is the consensus of opinion and we must have it, I do not want to be dependent upon a corporation whose friends admit that they are extortionists and that they are making unreasonable charges when they have the power to do it. I do not want the Government to be at their mercy.

We have now got all these ships, and since we have had this question before us the necessities for the Navy have been increasing every year. If we had spent \$4,000,000 for an armor factory three years ago, we would have had a plant of our own now, and we would have been independent of all of them; we could build a navy as we desired, and if armor plate is a necessity we would not have been tied down to these concerns. I want to break the cord.

Mr. TILLMAN. I will call the attention of the Senator from Nevada to the assertion of the Senator from Maine, that if we yield to these people now and do not build an armor factory we will be out of their clutches.

Mr. STEWART. We will be in their clutches.

Mr. TILLMAN. That is what I contend, but the Senator from Maine asserted the contrary, and I think he proved it to his own satisfaction that they will not dare any more to bother us.

Mr. STEWART. Is that the way to get your head out of the lion's mouth?

Mr. TILLMAN. That is the way the Senator asserts.

Mr. STEWART. Just to put your head in a little farther to get it out, that you will make them sick of it! No; you can not deal in that way with an insatiate and extortionate corporation that has got in the habit of doing those things. There is no use of putting your head in the lion's mouth any farther. We have got it in far enough now, and if we can get it out on any terms, let us get it out. Let us quit on any terms we can and not attempt to conciliate a corporation that has a disposition to rob the Government. Let us not treat it as an enemy that we dare not fight. If we can not fight this corporation, we had better not try to build a navy to fight the world if necessary. We had better not try to protect this country if we can not protect the Government against these corporations.

The first thing we want to do is to make this appropriation and secure the freedom of the Government. The whole country is looking at this thing. The best friends—I do not mean the friends, but those who are apologizing for the corporations and those who want to get along without building an establishment by the Government—admit the fact that they are unreasonable and extortionate in their demands. That being the case, let us get out of these armor contracts and let the country be free from

them. I shall vote for the proposition of the Senator from South Carolina, leaving any "if" out of the provision.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, only one word. I wish to congratulate my friend from Nevada that he has come over and joined those of us who are against trusts, and combinations, and corporations. Although it is even at the last hour, we are glad to have him come in. There used to be a hymn that I read when a boy:

While the lamp holds out to burn
The vilest sinner may return.

Therefore I most cordially welcome my friend, and I am glad to have him come in.

Mr. STEWART. I hope the Senator will welcome me to none of his trusts. I am in none of them. Is the Senator entirely free from trusts himself?

Mr. PERKINS. I am willing to trust in the Lord. [Laughter.]

Mr. STEWART. And to keep plenty of fuel in your steamships.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, the simple question is, Can the Government build this factory and manufacture armor plate at the figure your Committee on Naval Affairs has fixed at which the private establishment must furnish it or we will build a factory?

Mr. STEWART. I beg your pardon, that is not the question at all.

Mr. PERKINS. Then I am off—

Mr. STEWART. The question with me is, Shall we have a right to build a navy without having trusts upon our backs?

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, we have made some effort toward building a navy and the Navy is speaking for itself. It is covered with glory. Its history is a part of the brightest annals of the nineteenth century.

Mr. STEWART. I am glad the Navy is speaking for itself.

Mr. PERKINS. Now, I wish to reply on the royalty question and to refer to Senate Document No. 10. The Senator from New Hampshire says there is no royalty. If he will examine the views of the Treasury Department he will find that we have been paying \$11.20 per ton royalty for the harveyized steel.

Mr. HALE. Half a cent a pound.

Mr. PERKINS. Or a half a cent a pound.

Mr. CHANDLER. Did the Senator refer to me?

Mr. PERKINS. I understood you to say so.

Mr. CHANDLER. I did not say, in the first place, that there was no royalty. I said there was a Harvey patent, and that the Harvey patent had been acquired by the confederated armor-plate makers. I then said that the Harvey patent was contested, and that I believed it to be void, and that the Navy Department believed that they could go on with an armor-plate factory and make Krupp armor without being embarrassed by any patent.

Mr. PERKINS. Notwithstanding that—

Mr. STEWART. All the great manufacturing concerns in the United States—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California has the floor.

Mr. PERKINS. Notwithstanding this fact, our Government is paying one-half cent a pound royalty for harveyized armor plate. This letter from the Carnegie Steel Company, Limited, also makes a statement in relation to the Krupp royalty. I do not think they want any defenders, judging from their annual statement, which our friend from South Carolina has read.

Mr. TILLMAN. Right there, if the Senator will permit me—

Mr. PERKINS. I think they can look after their own interests. It is the Government's interests that I am trying to look after, with my friend from Nevada, at this time. In relation to the royalty they state as follows:

We also desire to reiterate our statement that we prefer to manufacture ordinary face-hardened armor at a net price of \$400 per ton than Krupp armor at the price given above.

It is not specially desired that the Bureau pay the royalty on armor manufactured by this process, as in the case of ordinary face-hardened armor, the verbal proposition only being made as an alternative one; that is to say, we would accept a price of \$500 per ton, provided the Bureau would assume the royalty, as in the case of the armor we are manufacturing for \$400 per ton.

It would seem by this that the Navy Department has recognized that the Krupp Company or their representatives in this country have a patent or a trade secret which we can not use or which is not available for our use unless we pay a certain royalty. Now, if we erect an armor factory it would be entirely discretionary with them whether they gave us the right to use this trade secret, this patent, if you please to call it so, without exacting from us a royalty upon every pound of armor plate that we manufactured.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. PERKINS. That is one of the things that should go into a consideration of these questions, and it is one which was considered

by your committee in arriving at the conclusion they have reached in their recommendation to the Senate.

Mr. STEWART obtained the floor.

Mr. TILLMAN. If the Senator will allow me, I will just show the proof in regard to the trade matter, and then I will sit down.

Mr. STEWART. All right.

Mr. TILLMAN. Before the Naval Committee of the Senate, Admiral O'Neil states—this is in Senate Document 127—

If we once have the place to make armor the inventors will be only too glad to give us the secret. If we did not allow them to make our armor they would be glad to let us have it.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, only one word in reply to that. One year ago our Government was using what was known as the patent of Gregory Gerdorf for a gas check for cannon—

Mr. STEWART. I did not give way for a long argument.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, this is in answer to the Senator from South Carolina. I had the floor and yielded to my friend.

Mr. STEWART. No, I did not yield to the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nevada decline to yield?

Mr. PERKINS. Will the Senator yield one moment for this statement?

Mr. STEWART. I will yield for one sentence now.

Mr. PERKINS. We then used that patent and said we would pay nothing. Last year they came to your Committee on Fortifications and Ordnance and said: "You can have the exclusive right for the United States to the use of this for \$22,000." We then placed a provision to that effect in the bill, but the committee of conference between the two Houses struck it out. This year they came before the committee of the House and said that the royalty which was due them upon the patent which they had would amount to over \$65,000, without any exclusive use of it in the United States. The result was that the committee finally agreed to give them \$50,000 for royalty upon that device, and that bill has passed both Houses.

So it would be in this case; and a similar thing would happen to this Government if we used either the harveyized patent or the Krupp patent; and we should have to pay perhaps millions of dollars for it before we got through.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator undertakes to prove that the United States can not defend itself against this monopoly by competition. I have always claimed that the remedy for trusts was competition; and in my speech the other day on trusts I pointed out that in times of prosperity, when there is plenty of money, you can have competition.

Mr. PERKINS. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. STEWART. You can have competition then; but when you say that we can break up these trusts by giving them more money, or that you can break up a trust by showing that it has got you in its power, you admit the trust is omnipotent and that the Government can not fight it. It seems like running away from fighting the trusts as a rabbit runs before a hound.

It is said that if we attempt to fight this trust there will be a little patent here and a little patent there, little cobwebs. If the Government establishes a plant of its own, it will control the price and be able to build a navy; but so long as it depends upon this extortionate corporation, which has shown its bad faith, so long you will have no navy. We need a navy; and, as I said before, if armor plate is necessary for a navy, it is necessary for us to throttle this trust or have no navy.

Mr. MONEY. Mr. President, I understood the distinguished Senator, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs [Mr. HALE], to say yesterday evening that the soft-capped shell would penetrate or impinge at an angle of greater incidence than would the hard shell. To-day I understand—I did not have the good fortune to hear the Senator at length—but I heard to-day that that was not exactly the statement which he made. I should be very glad if the Senator would now say exactly what he did state. I think it has a somewhat important bearing on this discussion; in other words, it may demonstrate whether it is worth while for us to have any armor at all on our ships.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I think the conclusion that the Bureau of Ordnance of the Navy Department have arrived at carries as a logical sequence the proposition that if we wait until armor plate is manufactured that is impenetrable by the best projectile at square range, there will be no more armor.

Mr. MONEY. Yes, I understood that; but that was not the question I asked the Senator.

Mr. HALE. I do not know but that I had better have read, in answer to the Senator, the memorandum that was sent to me by Admiral O'Neil. It is right on this point.

Mr. MONEY. I shall be very glad to hear it.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I think it will be a proper contribution to the discussion on the point suggested by the Senator from Mississippi if the memorandum, which is in substance a conversation had between Admiral O'Neil and myself on Monday night, be read. Let the Secretary read that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary proceeded to read the memorandum.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I hope during the reading of this communication, which is certainly important, that order will be preserved in the Chamber. I do not think any of us can hear the Clerk. He has a good penetrating voice, and yet it does not penetrate as far as my seat. Let us wait until there is order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Conversation in the Senate must cease. The Secretary will suspend the reading until it has ceased. [A pause.] The reading will now be proceeded with.

Mr. HALE. Let the Secretary start the reading at the beginning of the memorandum.

The Secretary read as follows:

[Memorandum for Senator HALE, by Rear-Admiral O'Neil, with regard to the perforation of armor by capped projectiles].

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 8, 1900.

1. No armor that exists to-day, regardless of its thickness or quality, can resist the power of the modern gun at short range. Therefore the fact that armor can readily be perforated at short range must not be considered an indication that it is of inferior quality. It simply means that it is over-matched by the gun. Naturally that which is the most difficult to perforate is the most desirable, and it has been determined that armor made by the new Krupp process is the most resisting for its thickness, and it therefore has been adopted by all leading maritime nations, and the latest vessels building for England, France, Germany, Russia, and Japan will all be supplied with it.

2. It has practically superseded harveyed armor, and is now practically the only kind being manufactured, except to wind up incomplete contracts made some years ago.

3. Armor is but a partial protection at best, and as ships can carry but a limited weight of it, it stands to reason that the most resisting quality should be used; notwithstanding that it is but a partial protection, it is the best that can be devised, and distance and oblique impacts are large factors in its favor. Ships will never engage at short range, if it can be helped, because it would bring them under the most energetic fire of every gun in the enemy's vessel, both great and small.

4. All tests for the acceptance of armor, both in this country and abroad, are made with uncapped projectiles, and the tests heretofore and now applied are about as severe as can prudently be applied. Occasionally a very superior plate made by the Harvey process gets to the proving ground which would stand a test considerably higher than that prescribed, and the same will, without doubt, be the case with Krupp plates, but the regulation test must be such as will allow a reasonable factor of safety and allow for the ordinary and legitimate variation in a group of well-made plates.

5. It is a well known fact that a soft-steel cap attached to the point of an armor-piercing projectile increases its efficiency to a marked extent; anywhere, in fact, from 15 to 20 and often to 25 per cent, and all such projectiles for the United States Navy are fitted with caps.

6. A very large number of comparative tests were made at Indian Head with capped and uncapped projectiles which fully demonstrated the value of the soft cap, and it is customary now, after regular armor tests, to fire an extra capped shot or two simply for the purpose of gaining information. A few days ago at Indian Head a 6-inch capped shell was easily driven through 14 inches of harveyed armor, and the same has been done through 8 inches of Krupp armor. These shots of course were fired with high velocities at a distance of a few hundred feet. This fact, however, in no way discredits the armor.

7. All the ballistic tests made at Indian Head for the acceptance of Krupp armor have been of a most satisfactory character and have shown it to be all that is claimed for it. The only such armor tested has been for the Russian Government, and the tests were prescribed and witnessed by a technical commission of Russian naval officers who are most careful and exacting in seeing that the requirements are fully met and that the data obtained is complete.

8. The present United States test for 6-inch harveyed plates is two shots from a 6-inch gun, each having a striking velocity of 1,659 foot-seconds and a striking energy of 3,729 foot-tons. The test for a 6-inch Krupp plate is four shots from a 6-inch gun, each having a striking velocity of 1,885 foot-seconds and a striking energy of 7,221 foot-tons.

9. An 8-inch Krupp plate is tested with four shots from an 8-inch gun, each having a striking velocity of 1,825 foot-seconds. The test for a harveyed 8-inch plate is two shots with a striking velocity of 1,558 foot-seconds.

10. The above are graphic illustrations of the increased severity of the tests for Krupp over harveyed armor.

11. No experiments have been made which discredit armor made by either the harveyed or Krupp process.

12. Experiments have been made which show the great value of the soft-capped projectile against either kind of armor. Should the Government undertake to make armor there is no reason to suppose that they would be able to make it of better quality than the private manufacturers; in fact, there is every reason to suppose that they would not make it as good, being without experience and with a somewhat limited knowledge of the subject. I have no hesitation in saying that no pains or expense is spared by the present manufacturers to produce the very best article of the kind they have agreed to supply.

13. The total amount of armor contracted for to date is 35,773 tons, costing \$19,460,280; an average price of \$543.99, without certain royalties for the Harvey process of one-half a cent per pound, which the Government has paid or agreed to pay. The contracts for this armor have extended over thirteen years, an average quantity of 2,752 tons per annum.

14. I estimate roughly that the total quantity of armor required for ships authorized and for those on the present bill is as follows:

	Tons.
Maine and class	7,359
5 battle ships at 3,400 tons each	17,000
6 armored cruisers at 1,800 tons each	10,800
Total	35,159

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I am extremely glad that the suggestion of the Senator from Mississippi has brought out the reading of this document. I had intended to put it into the discussion; but it could never come in more appropriately than now. It is the result of an interview between the Admiral and myself on Monday night last, in which I made a memorandum for him of certain questions that I wanted him to answer, which he has

done most faithfully; and I can conceive of nothing that would shed more light upon this whole discussion than the statement of Admiral O'Neil in this memorandum.

Mr. MONEY. Mr. President, I quite agree with the honorable Senator in that remark. I think the reading of that paper has shed a great deal of light, and I congratulate myself that my question brought it into the discussion. It is a very valuable contribution. Among other things, it shows that this supposed secret about these soft-nose projectiles is no secret at all. It is known to every naval establishment in the world.

Mr. HALE. I believe the Senator is right about that.

Mr. MONEY. It is known everywhere, all over the world.

Mr. HALE. Of course there was at first a kind of mystery or lack of knowledge on the part of a great many Senators, and I did not know of it myself.

Mr. MONEY. It was pure crass ignorance on the part of this Senate. Everybody else knew of it except ourselves.

Mr. HALE. Everybody else knew it, and had known it for years.

Mr. MONEY. Yes; everybody else knew it. It shows further that there is no armor that can not be penetrated by this superior projectile.

Then there is a proposition to put upon American war ships an inferior armor that can be more easily penetrated, and at the same time of much greater weight, thereby complicating the problem of floatation in the building of battle ships. So I think we ought to eliminate the harveyized armor entirely from the question. We never ought, in my judgment, to put upon a ship anything but the very best armor.

Mr. HALE. I think the Senator is right about that, and practically that has been done. The Department has, aside from the contracts made for Harvey armor, declined to go on and put any more Harvey armor on ships, unless we so direct, upon just the grounds that the Senator puts it, that it is inferior armor.

Mr. MONEY. I think that was very proper in the Department, and I think the Senate is failing in its duty if it does not have discontinued the use of inferior armor.

That opens the question to my mind whether it is worth while to have any armor at all. I do not know whether the committee has considered that subject, and I do not know whether the proper bureau of the Navy Department has considered it; but if ships are to have heavy armor at a vast expense to the Government, and that armor can be penetrated by projectiles of a certain weight and at a certain muzzle velocity that has been mentioned here in these experiments, I do not see what is the use of armor at all.

It does not require close action to penetrate this armor. Take the gun that Admiral O'Neil has presented, that is made right here in the city of Washington, a 12-inch gun, made here at the navy-yard, and it will throw a projectile of 850 pounds 9 miles with an accuracy that would astonish a rifle shot. You can hit my hat a thousand yards with one of those guns. The *Pluton*, a little torpedo-boat destroyer, a short line on the margin of the sea, was sunk by a shot from a 12-inch gun at a distance of 3½ miles, and her consort, the *Terror*, was destroyed at the same distance and by the same gun. A battle ship with the harveyized armor or with the Krupp armor could be penetrated at a distance of 3 or 4 miles.

I have not given any particular study lately to this matter, and, as I confessed a while ago, I was ignorant of these developments; but it is well worth while to consider it; and if the committee who have had the matter under consideration have come to any conclusion upon it, I would be glad to be enlightened; and I certainly shall be glad to yield to their information upon this subject, whether it is worth while to armor vessels at great cost and at the expense of floatation and of speed, in order to secure an armor that will be valuable at such ranges as no sea fight is likely to be fought.

Mr. HALE rose.

Mr. MONEY. I shall be glad to hear from the Senator.

Mr. HALE. I think the Senator, while right in his general proposition, is wrong about the distances. I do not think, with the best armor obtainable, that at 2, 3, or 4 miles the armor of a ship could be perforated by any of these projectiles. In such a case, where the firing was at a distance, as it was off Santiago, the best armor would be useful and would be protective. If fleets of great modern ships shall ever come together, as they did at Trafalgar or at St. Vincent or in the Nile—

Mr. MONEY. Perhaps they never will.

Mr. HALE. But if they ever should, nothing in the shape of armor that has been either invented or built or even imagined could stand against the projectiles.

Mr. MONEY. I think not.

Mr. HALE. But the experiments that have been made are not made, as they would be in actual naval warfare, at a distance of 1, 2, and 3 miles, but they are made at relatively short distances, to show, first, the superiority of one kind of armor over another, and then the superiority of the armor or the projectile at near range, so as to get at certain fundamental propositions upon which

to build. I do not think the Senator's conclusion is wise, that because it has been demonstrated that at short range a projectile will penetrate an armor plate, therefore we should cease armoring the ships with the best armor where the contest will be not at a near range, but at a distant range.

Mr. MONEY. If the Senator will allow me, I have come to no conclusion. I asked for information if the committee had considered the subject.

Mr. HALE. Yes; and I am trying to state, and I think the Senator sees whatever force there may be in my proposition, that in actual contests in war our ships will not be subjected to this near experiment, which is made for the purpose of determining which projectile is best, which armor plate is best; and that therefore we should not stop armoring, with the best armor we can get, the ships that will be tested, not at the proving grounds, not at navy-yards, but upon the sea against other navies, against other fleets, where there will be maneuvering, and where, instead of there being eight or ten hundred yards between them, there will be a mile or 2 or 3 miles; and the committee's conclusion is that it is best for us to go on and get the best armor we can and put it on the ships.

Mr. MONEY. There has been an instance of a naval engagement under present conditions in the fight between the Japanese and the Chinese fleets off the mouth of the Yalu River.

Mr. HALE. That was the nearest.

Mr. MONEY. There was a hand to hand contest, a melee, and the ships even attempted to ram one another. The Senator will recollect that the Chinese war ship, having received what was considered a fatal wound, attempted to ram a Japanese vessel within a hundred yards of her, but before she reached her enemy she sank like a bullet. The Senator will also recollect that there was no armored battle ships in the Japanese fleet, and that the whole superstructure almost of the two principal Japanese cruisers was absolutely eaten away by the small shot. They had the finest guns that we knew anything about at that time; they had Krupp and Canet guns on both fleets, and the Senator will recollect an instance where one shot from a Canet gun swept the whole battery off one side of a Japanese ship, killed fifty-seven men, dismounted every gun on that side, and destroyed everything in the way.

Mr. President, that fight was within as close range as it was at Trafalgar, St. Vincent, or the Nile, except that they did not lash themselves to one another, yard arm to yard arm, as was done in those days with long toms, carronades, 6-pounders, and wood ships. The Japanese fleet circled continually around the Chinese fleet. The Senator may very well reply to me by saying that the whole Chinese fleet was saved by the fact that they had two armored battle ships.

Mr. HALE. That was all.

Mr. MONEY. But the question now is whether it will be worth while to go into the business of armoring ships any more. While I am no authority on ordnance, it seems to me as a layman that when a projectile weighing 850 pounds, with a muzzle energy of 46,246 foot-tons and a muzzle velocity of 2,800 foot-seconds—throwing that projectile at a vessel 3 or 4 miles away, it could easily penetrate any armor likely to be put on any ship. The Senator shakes his head, and I yield to his superior knowledge on this question, but I say if we are to armor these ships we ought to have the best armor.

I happened to be one of a committee of the House of Representatives which investigated the armor frauds several years ago, and I visited the works of Mr. Carnegie with the committee. We had before us the superintendent, who was quoted here a while ago by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN], and the foremen who had charge of the steel from the time the ingots went into the furnace until the armor was fitted for its place on the ship, and the frauds there were perfectly obvious. The superintendent himself confessed that the instrument used to test the tensile strength of the bolts that held the armor in place was "jockeyed" in the test, to use his own expression, and the man whose business it was to work the instrument confessed to the "jockeying."

He went further, and he said that even in dealing commercially with private parties the same "jockeying" was going on. We know that the armor plate was full of blowholes, and that each plate of armor is cut in two, and that the lower half is better metal than the upper because of the settling of certain components, and that the lower half was sent to the test grounds at Indian Head to stand the ballistic test for a group of upper half plates, when it was no test at all for the upper half.

We also discovered—and everybody has seen it, perhaps—that the foremen doctored their books; that the agent of the Government, the naval officer of the Government there, and the superintendent of construction of this armor plate, under a contract which provided that the Government should be constantly informed of every process in the manufacture of that armor, was continually deceived. All these facts have been published to the

world. That company getting a little into disrepute, being fined very heavily by the Secretary of the Navy—and, by the way, the fine was subsequently remitted in part—the Bethlehem Company obtained a contract, and part of it was given to Carnegie.

Now, we are informed in this debate that there is an international trust; that Krupp, with his secret, and Harvey, with his patents, and these two American companies—the Krupp Company abroad and others; for I believe there are several of these establishments in France and one or two in Italy—have organized an international trust to impose not only on this Government, but on others. We have the spectacle of Carnegie taking a contract from the Russian Government for armor at \$249 a ton, when we were paying that company not less than \$450 a ton. The result of that investigation, if I am correct, was a resolution or a bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER], which provided that not more than \$300, including the royalty of \$11 a long ton, should be paid.

The question now is whether we are still longer to be subjected to the extortion of this international trust or this domestic trust, or whatever it may be, with their patents and their secrets. There is no difficulty, if the Government undertakes to manufacture for itself, in getting whatever secret is now used by any manufacturer in the world. It seems to me, with the amount of armor, 37,000 tons, I believe—

Mr. STEWART. Thirty-five thousand tons.

Mr. MONEY. Thirty-five thousand tons, in the programme of construction authorized and about to be authorized to be constructed, there is an immense profit to the United States in building its own plant at some point where coal and iron and limestone are in juxtaposition and will make material cheap. The Government will not only save money, but it will get the best article, and it will not require an inspector to see that there are no blowholes, no false tests, no jockeying with the instruments that test the strength of the bolt that fastens the armor to the side of the ship.

It seems to me there is nothing in the proposition in this case that the Government should not compete with private citizens in work; and I fully agree with that doctrine, generally. We have a gun factory, competing with private factories. That was objected to at first on the same ground, and we are making now the finest guns in the world.

Mr. HALE. We never competed with the gun makers who make the gun itself. They send it down and we finish it. The assembling is all done by private parties. All that the Government does is to finish it.

Mr. MONEY. I know that when the gun comes here it is rough bored. We put the jacket on the gun; we rifle the gun; we really make the gun. We make it of such quality that it has no superior in the world, according to the reports of our ordnance officers.

Mr. HAWLEY. The parts come here rough turned, rough bored.

Mr. MONEY. That is my understanding.

Mr. HAWLEY. And they are finally executed, finished, and assembled here.

Mr. MONEY. I understand that.

Mr. HAWLEY. It is called a gun factory, but it is only partially a gun factory?

Mr. MONEY. It is a gun factory in the completion of that instrument which is considered now the best weapon in the world, just exactly as if you would bring the raw ore. The gun is finished here, and there is no superior to it, and I do not see any reason why the Government should not have the best armor that can be made in the world at a cost that is very much less than what we are compelled to pay to the international trust.

Now, I want the distinguished Senator from Maine to understand that I am not opposing in any particular his propositions here, although I shall vote with my friend the Senator from South Carolina for a Government plant, because I believe it is the cheapest and best. There is something in a great nation like this being held by the throat by two corporations here and a few abroad and being compelled to pay what every man here knows to be an exorbitant price.

Mr. HALE. Does not the Senator, who is very quick of apprehension, see the difference, when he uses the strong metaphor of these establishments holding the Government by the throat, between letting them have their way, without let or hindrance, and fixing their price, as they did in all the first years of our building up of the Navy, and the scheme of the committee now to hold them down to a moderate price, a price at which we can not make it, and if they do not take that, then to make an armor plant, because we will be obliged to?

Mr. MONEY. That is a reasonable proposition.

Mr. HALE. The committee felt that instead of letting these people have their own way we are holding them up. We say on all the testimony we can get that nobody can furnish armor—no private establishment, and the Government certainly can not—for less than what we offer to give them, and if they are not

reasonable enough, if they do not cease their exactions, if they do not cease taking us by the throat, and make the contract for the moderate price of \$445, which is only \$31 more than is paid for the harveyized armor, including all royalties, then we will have an armor plant. Now, does not the Senator see the difference between that programme and letting these people have their entire way?

Mr. MONEY. Certainly.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. MONEY. In one moment. I perhaps used a strong expression—held by the throat—but I had in mind when I spoke the time some little while ago when we very badly needed ships and the ships were arrested in construction because these gentlemen would not furnish armor except at their own price. I called that held by the throat. Now, whether they can repeat it or not depends upon the willingness of this Congress to check them by saying we will have a plant of our own. From my limited knowledge of the subject, and I have the advantage from assisting in that investigation into armor making and the frauds committed by the company upon the Government of knowing a little about it, I do not believe that \$445 is a low price or a moderate price.

I believe with the Senator from New Hampshire when he declared years ago that armor of the very best could be made at a profit at \$300 a ton. I have not time now, nor would the Senate care to hear the reasons detailed which moved me to that conclusion. I do not want to interfere with the programme of the committee, and, as I said at the outset, I have no doubt they have given this matter consideration, which I have been unable to give and have not given, I confess; but in this matter of an armor plant I shall vote with the Senator from South Carolina, because I believe it is the best way and the surest way and the cheapest way.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I do not desire to discuss this question particularly, but I have a document here from the Navy Department which I wish somebody who knows more about it than I to explain.

I find in this document, which came to us yesterday, that they speak of a gun with a muzzle velocity of 2,800 foot-seconds, having a muzzle energy of 46,246 foot-tons. I suppose they mean by this statement that that class of projectiles at that speed would penetrate harveyized armor 19½ inches and Krupp 15½ inches. But I find in Document 10 what would lead me to suppose, if I did not doubt it from some knowledge I have on the subject, that they meant to say that they had penetrated 21.42 inches of harveyized steel and 16.84 inches of Krupp. I wish somebody, the Senator who has charge of this bill or the Senator who has been Secretary of the Navy, to tell me whether they have made any such progress in gunnery as this indicates.

Mr. HALE. That is a document which was sent to me, and I had it printed. I suppose those tables represent just this: They show what experiments have been made with certain thicknesses of armor. Then they carry that out proportionately as to thicker plates, and they show what, if they did make these experiments, would be the result logically on thicker plates. I do not understand that any experiments have actually been made on the thickest plate that is indicated there. I do not know that there is any such plate. I suppose that is only a calculation.

Mr. TELLER. The Senator from Maine says there is not any plate but that this soft-nosed shell would perforate.

Mr. HALE. What I mean by that is any plate which it would be practicable to put on a ship.

Mr. TELLER. Of course; I understand that.

Mr. HALE. I do not suppose, if you put on a plate of 3 feet in thickness—

Mr. TELLER. You can not do that.

Mr. HALE. But that can not be done, because then at once you sink the ship. But up to the point of floatation and the usefulness of a ship, as a ship in the water, and a ship to be taken about from one place to another, maneuvered, and all that—up to that point, which the engineers and ordnance officers know, no armor up to this time has been either found or thought of that would stand the most piercing projectile.

Mr. TELLER. What a projectile will do must be determined upon its distance, upon the distance that it goes, and the way it strikes the object. All these experiments are under the most favorable circumstances for the penetration qualities. For instance, take these muzzle experiments—perforation at muzzle. In that case there is no elevation. The gun stands on a level and the projectile strikes squarely against the plate. It is not a plate which is curved, as it may be on the ship, but it is a plate presented squarely, while if the ship was 3 miles off the projectile might strike it at a very different angle. The shell itself would be in a different position; it would not be striking on.

In order to reach any considerable distance the gun must have an elevation, and when it has an elevation with the natural drop of gravity the projectile always drops with its heel or its heaviest

part down, and it never strikes as it strikes at the muzzle. So these experiments are not of very much value, when you come to them. I do not myself believe we have ever had any 3,000 foot-seconds experiments, although we may have, perhaps; but 2,000 is regarded as a pretty good speed.

I only wanted to know, because when I got it I thought we had made the most remarkable advance in gunnery, and as I had not been looking up the subject of gunnery for a year or two, I thought I was really a great ways behind. But I went to the Senator from New Hampshire and he told me he thought this is a sort of theoretical arrangement or understanding. I wish the Senate to understand that, so we will not be misled into supposing we have the tremendous engines of war which this would indicate we have. We have not got them.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I think I ought, before a vote is taken, to state the reasons which have induced me to differ with the majority of the committee and to vote for the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN]. The Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] has stated very clearly and dispassionately the situation in reference to armor, and he has presented, as a solution of a very difficult question, the proposition that we shall fix a price of \$445 a ton for armor, and that if these two combined companies—the Carnegie and the Bethlehem—will make 34,000 tons for \$445 a ton, which will be about \$17,000,000 paid to them, they shall be allowed to make it; but if they will not do it, then we will pay them \$545 a ton for armor for the three battle ships, the hulls of which are now constructed, and then build an armor plant and ourselves manufacture the additional armor which we may want.

Mr. President, on the other hand, the proposition for which I contend as being on the whole the best thing is to submit to pay \$545 a ton for armor for the three battle ships—the *Maine*, *Ohio*, and *Missouri*—but build an armor plant and manufacture the rest of the armor. My proposition and the proposition of the Senator from South Carolina, as to the authority to be given at this time to procure armor, is in conformity with the opinion of Admiral O'Neil, the very able Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, whose letter the Senator from Maine has just submitted. In a letter of May 1 to the Secretary of the Navy, forwarding certain correspondence between himself and the armor makers, wherein they refused to take less than \$545 a ton for armor, he says:

In the opinion of the Bureau, it would not be advisable at the present time to consider the purchase of armor for other vessels than the *Maine*, *Missouri*, and *Ohio*, as conditions may change at any time not only as to the character of armor, but as to its cost and as to the sources of supply.

The reason why the Chief of the Bureau believes such action is sufficient at this time is because there is really no great haste about settling this business. There is really no necessity for providing at this time for 34,000 tons of armor, to cost \$17,000,000. The armor factories will be out of work this fall.

If they begin the work on the armor for these three ships, it will occupy them about a year, and, in my judgment, an armor factory for the Government can be erected within a year. I know other Senators differ from me; I hear contradictions around me, but I maintain my opinion nevertheless. The cost of an armor plant and the length of time required to put it into operation have been very much exaggerated by the opponents of an armor plant. The reasons why I think we ought to begin on an armor plant at this time are simple.

In the first place, I ask the Senator from Maine and I ask other Senators who advocate making a contract with these two companies now for \$17,000,000 of armor, what they are going to do when those contracts end? Are we going to stop building armored ships or are we going to build more battle ships with armor on them? If we are going to build more, then at the end of three or four years we shall be in exactly the same trouble as now and it will further appear, that whereas we have already paid to these companies \$20,000,000 for 35,000 tons of armor we will have paid them \$17,000,000 more for 34,000 additional tons to build up their monopoly; and we will be more than ever in their clutches, to use the expression of one Senator.

Mr. STEWART. It would be \$18,900,000 for the 35,000 tons.

Mr. ALLISON. At what rate?

Mr. TILLMAN. Five hundred and forty-five dollars.

Mr. CHANDLER. Whether it is four hundred and fifty or five hundred or five hundred and forty-five does not make much difference to my argument on this point. Are we at the end of buying and using or of making and using armor when we have paid this \$17,000,000 additional to these two monopolies? That is the question I ask.

Mr. HALE. I do not quite see the force, as an argument, of that question.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator is not called upon to do that. He may answer the question, if he desires.

Mr. HALE. Of course I can not answer it as well as if I could see what the Senator is driving at. I do not see that what we will do hereafter has anything to do with what we will do now. If we get settled here a reasonable price for this armor, and get

contracts for the ships that are now awaiting it and the ships that we now propose to build, the natural presumption in human affairs is that that will settle it in the future. I have no fear whatever, if these companies come to the terms of this bill and furnish the armor at \$445, which I have no doubt is less than the Government can make it for, that they will ever attempt to get more. There is no possibility that they will.

Mr. CHANDLER. That is an answer to the question, and it is in effect that the Senator does not see any danger ahead. I see very great danger ahead. I see that we are going to be worse off after we have paid them—first \$20,000,000 and then \$17,000,000—than we are now. Reluctant as I have been to have the Government enter upon what some Senators call paternalism—the manufacturing of armor—I am inclined to believe now that we ought two or three years ago to have built an armor factory.

The Senator from Maine said something about this paternalism. But within two years we have appropriated a large sum of money to enable the Bureau of Ordnance to make smokeless powder. Why did we do that? There are many powder factories in this country. They can make smokeless powder, and make it as good as we can; but Captain O'Neil came to us with the request, indorsed by the Secretary of the Navy, and we have appropriated several hundred thousand dollars—I do not know how much—to build a smokeless powder factory. Why did we do that?

Mr. HALE. We did that because—

Mr. CHANDLER. We did it because we were afraid that the combined powder makers of this country would charge us too high prices.

Mr. HALE. It was not so much that. In time of war we thought it desirable to do it; and I venture to predict that what we put out on that factory will be dead matter.

Mr. CHANDLER. I did not want to do it, but the Senator from Maine—

Mr. HALE. No; I did not want to do it.

Mr. CHANDLER. But the Senator from Maine, as usual, overruled me in committee, and I supported it—

Mr. HALE. I did not want to do it.

Mr. CHANDLER. Because I was asked to help put an end to any powder monopoly.

Mr. HALE. I thought it would be better to do the other thing, I am glad the Senator has invoked this, as I was going to do it myself. Every dollar we have put into the smokeless-powder factory will be sunk money, as much so as if dropped into the Atlantic Ocean. It never will produce a pound of smokeless powder.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator will bring in appropriations to pay the remaining bills for putting it up. It is paternalism, if an armor-plate factory is paternalism, and we built it because we would not be in the hands of the powder makers of the country, and we ought to build an armor plant so that we will not be in the hands of the armor-plate makers of the country.

I come back now to the question which I asked the Senator from Maine. What are you going to do when you have given them this 34,000 tons of armor to make and \$17,000,000 to make it with if after that we are going on to build more battle ships? We shall have to submit, probably, to some new invention. When they found we would pay them but \$400 a ton for harveyized armor they went to work and invented the Krupp armor and said we must pay \$545 for that. What is there to it? Nothing in the world except they harden the face of the plate a little more.

The way to make armor hard is to supercarburize the face of it with charcoal or charcoal gas, and the harveyed armor is penetrated by carbon perhaps a half or three-quarters of an inch and the Krupp armor is penetrated by carbon perhaps an inch and a half. That is all there is to it. Anybody can do it. There is not a patent on it that is worth anything. When anybody undertakes to say that we have not mechanics skilled enough to build such a Government factory and make these plates in it, he does great injustice to the American mechanics.

Mr. HALE. The Senator stated that right. I agree with him. That is a part of the basis of the committee's action. There is not very much difference, I think. We give them only \$31 difference between what we have been paying for the harveyed armor—

Mr. CHANDLER. You have not given it to them yet, and they have not agreed to take it. That is only the Senator's hypothesis.

Mr. HALE. We make that as the basis.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not want to be diverted from my argument.

Mr. HALE. I want the Senator to bear that in mind—we give them only \$31 more.

Mr. CHANDLER. Exactly. Let us see where we started. We did pay four or five hundred dollars a ton for armor in the beginning.

Mr. HALE. Six hundred.

Mr. CHANDLER. Six hundred far back in time; then the price went down to \$545. What had the Bethlehem and Carnegie companies done?

In 1895—

I read from Secretary Herbert's report, which is House Document No. 151, Fifty-fourth Congress, first session, page 21—

In 1895 Russia was in the market for harveyed nickel armor.

First we were told we must put nickel into the armor, and we did. Then we were told we must buy harveyed armor, and we did. How well I remember the eulogy of the Senator from Maine in this Chamber upon harveyed armor, when he glorified the American inventor and boasted of the great discovery of the Harvey armor; and when some of us wanted to hold back a little on the price of it, he said: "A great invention." "It has revolutionized warfare." "A world-wide discovery."

Mr. HALE. It was.

Mr. CHANDLER. But now we are told it is worthless; it will not do to put on our battle ships, and men are unpatriotic who want to send our seamen out to fight with inferior armor on our battle ships. Any man who makes any contest against paying \$17,000,000 more for armor to these two monopolies is said to be unpatriotic simply because he is disposed to be economical.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. CHANDLER. No; I will not yield to the Senator now.

Mr. TILLMAN. I hope the Senator will not be so obdurate as not to let me put in a thought right here.

Mr. CHANDLER. I have so many of my own, that I think are better than the Senators, that I think I shall have to go on.

Mr. TILLMAN. I have to leave the city.

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senator will agree not to go to Baltimore and make the speech he is going to make, I will yield to him.

Mr. TILLMAN. I am obliged to go to Baltimore, because I foolishly made an agreement to go, and I usually try to keep my promises. Otherwise I would be very delighted to stay and hear the Senator. But I want to ask him to ask the Senator from Maine, because I am really afraid to ask him, whether or not if this were a proposition that the United States should present to the Carnegie and Bethlehem companies the battle ship *Oregon* he would vote for it; just make them a present of it.

Mr. CHANDLER (to Mr. HALE). Is that the inquiry?

Mr. HALE. He asks me.

Mr. CHANDLER. I did not hear the question.

Mr. TILLMAN. You ask him.

Mr. CHANDLER. I did not hear the question, but I ask the Senator from Maine to answer it.

Mr. HALE. I have to receive it through the medium of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. CHANDLER. I was just then endeavoring to answer a question of the Senator from Colorado near me, and I did not hear the question of the Senator from South Carolina. So I think I had better go on.

Mr. Herbert called our attention to certain facts, and I want every Senator to hear them:

In 1895 Russia was in the market for harveyed nickel armor. The Bethlehem and Carnegie companies, in the United States, were then both well established, and neither had sufficient orders from this Government to employ its plant continuously. There was sharp competition for the order from Russia, and the Bethlehem Company secured the contract for manufacturing armor for one ship at the very low price of \$249 per ton, this armor to be both nickelled and harveyed and to be delivered in Russia.

There is where the controversy over this armor question began, as Senators very well know; and nobody believes that the Bethlehem Company lost money on that armor. They never were able to show that they lost money on it.

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator from New Hampshire permit me?

Mr. CHANDLER. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. The Senator is not only a very adroit and interesting debater; he means to be a fair debater. Does he not know that this single instance of furnishing Harvey armor at \$240 a ton by this company has been exploited scores of times, and that it has always been explained as a single instance of what a company did in order to get into the European market, to get its wares in there?

Mr. CHANDLER. Is that the whole of the Senator's question?

Mr. HALE. Well, I will make it in the form of a statement. It has never been contended that there was any other contract. It was simply to get into the European market.

Mr. CHANDLER. Now, after the Senator's compliment to me, I will say that what he says is true; they have so claimed. But what I said was that it never had been shown that they lost money on the contract, and it can not be demonstrated to-day that they lost money on it. I referred to the fact in order to show the beginning of this controversy about armor. It led to an investigation by the Naval Committee, of which the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] and I were members, and a report was made on the armor question, Report No. 1453, Fifty-fourth Congress, second session, November 11, 1897. Although that report was made by me, the findings of it were very carefully considered by the Naval Committee. The statements as I had written them were very much modified, and the whole committee concurred in the re-

port. Secretary Herbert had estimated that armor could be produced for about \$250.

He added for profit 50 per cent, or \$125, making \$375. Then he added for nickel \$20, and he made up \$395, or in a round number \$400 a ton for armor. That is what Secretary Herbert had estimated, while the committee reported that a fair average price to be paid for armor for the three new battle ships authorized by the act of June 10, 1896, would be between \$300 and \$400 per ton of 2,240 pounds. The committee put their estimate in a general way as being somewhere between \$300 and \$400, allowing only 33½ per cent for profit, and thus making the estimate about \$350. It appeared substantially from the thorough investigation of Secretary Herbert that the Bethlehem Company must have got back their money on the \$249 contract which they made with Russia. They may have done the work without profit, but not at a loss.

Now, Mr. President, I will not detain the Senate long. The result of all that controversy was that Congress by law limited the price of armor. We limited it to \$400, and we limited it on two or three occasions to \$300. What then happened? These two monopolies—a part of an international trust, as Senators have stated, the foreign armor makers and the American armor makers being in combination—finding that the Government was determined to get out of their clutches very shortly, said they had invented a new armor, and the Krupp armor was brought forward. The harveyized armor was ridiculed and denounced and laid aside, and the Krupp armor was claimed to be the only armor that we could afford to put upon our battleships.

I will not undertake to go in detail into the merits of this Krupp armor. The companies put some chrome into it, and they put a little more nickel into it, and they forced the carbon, as I have said, into the face of it three times as deep as they had forced the carbon into the face of the harveyed plates. That is all there is to it, Mr. President.

As I said to my colleague a little while ago, they also bought up the Harvey process. Whether they claim any additional patents or not I do not know, but the royalties of \$45 a ton which they say we ought to pay include anything that we might be required to pay for the patents on the Harvey process. But I venture the assertion that I have made before, that the United States can build a factory and make just as good armor as the Krupp armor and not be obliged to pay a dollar for patents or a dollar for royalty to anybody under heaven.

Now, Mr. President, why should we not do this? I say we should do it, unless you are to come to the end of building battle ships when those are built provided for in this bill. If we are never going to build any more battle ships, if, having purchased 35,000 tons of armor at a cost of \$20,000,000 and being now about to purchase 34,000 tons at \$17,000,000 more, we never are going to need any more armor for battle ships, I grant that we had better pay the price of \$545 a ton. But, Mr. President, I do not understand that anybody argues that these are all the battleships we are ever going to have. If there is any Senator who says or believes that, then I think he should advocate paying \$545 a ton for this armor.

But nobody believes that. If we are to be a world-wide power, we are going on to build battle ships, armored battle ships, for the next twenty years. But if I am wrong, and we are not going on to build any more ships than will be armored by the 34,000 tons of armor, it seems to me that we had better wait until next winter, by postponing some of the battle ships that are provided in this bill. If this is all the armor we are ever going to use, I agree we had better pay \$545 for it, but even in that case we had better not order all the battle ships that we are ever going to have at this session of Congress. We had better postpone the construction of some of them, and follow the recommendation of Captain O'Neil, Chief of the Bureau, and make no provision at this session except for the three ships that are now built. If we are going to keep on building battle ships, let us now pay \$545 a ton for the armor, and hereafter let us, Mr. President, make our own armor.

Mr. President, the Committee on Naval Affairs, in the report to which I have alluded, found:

That a Government armor factory could be erected for the sum of \$1,500,000, and that it is expedient to establish such a factory in case the armor manufacturers decline to accept such prices for armor as may be fixed by law.

That finding of the committee was in accordance with the opinion of Secretary Herbert. It should be explained that this million and a half for an armor factory did not include the price of a steel plant. It was the estimated cost of an armor factory proper, which should take from the manufacturers of steel the steel ingot and put it under the hammer or under the hydraulic press and shape it, and then by other machinery proceed to fashion it into armor plate.

We can build, if we choose, for a million and a half dollars an armor plant near a steel plant. We can go to Pennsylvania and locate our factory near a steel plant, or near steel plants, which will produce for us steel ingots exactly as we want them, with the proper chemical ingredients; or we can do what is better—go to

Chattanooga, or to Birmingham, or to Sheffield, or somewhere else in the coal and iron section of that part of the country.

There is nothing very mysterious or troublesome about the process of making armor. I hope the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] before this debate is over will tell the Senate, for he has seen the Bethlehem plant, whether there would be anything very difficult in having American mechanics build a Government armor-plate factory and make armor plate. It is not fine work. It is nothing like the work that is done in building guns at the Washington Navy-Yard. There is needed a hydraulic press to take the ingot from the furnace and shape it. That is heavy work, but it is not difficult work. A press will cost about half a million dollars. Then the plate has to be shaped to go on the side of the ship, and for the purpose of shaping the plates you need about half a million dollars more for tools, and that is about all you need after you have provided the steel ingots.

Now, Mr. President, it is extremely discreditable to American mechanics to say they can not do that thing in a Government factory, and it is not creditable to Captain O'Neil to send a communication in here to-day in answer to the questions of the Senator from Maine, stating that our mechanics can not make this armor under his direction. He sent it in just as willingly as he went down to Indian Head yesterday morning to fire a 6-inch shell through a harveyed plate, because it was necessary to the progress of this debate that a shell should go through a harveyed plate.

Mr. President, it is not creditable to say that the American mechanics can not do this work at a Government plant, because we know they can do this work. The whole difficulty has been magnified whenever the question has been submitted to naval officers. There is a voluminous report here from the naval officers who went out and looked the country over to see how much it would cost to locate and build an armor plant. They knew the policy of the Department was not to have an armor plant, and they made the expenses perfectly enormous.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President—

Mr. CHANDLER. In one moment. But I confront the report of those officers with the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs and with the report of Secretary Herbert, and I say that within a year, or a year and a half at the most, we can have a Government armor plant that can make armor and can make it as good, as strong, and as reliable as the armor that we can get from these combined manufacturers. Now I will yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. TELLER. I wish to ask the Senator if he does not recall that about the time we let the contract to the Bethlehem Company for guns and entered into a contract for armor plate it was stated in the Senate in debate that we could not make armor plate or gun metal in this country? We have demonstrated certainly that we can beat the world on gun metal, whatever we may have done on armor plate.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. TELLER. The same claim was made then that is being made to-day, that we could not do it.

Mr. LODGE. All our armor plate has been made in this country. We have not bought any foreign armor plate.

Mr. TELLER. I know that. It was said that we could not make it as good as it was made abroad; and as to gun metal, it was said that we could not make it here.

Mr. CHANDLER. How soon does the Senator from South Carolina have to go to Baltimore?

Mr. TILLMAN. I shall have to ask the chairman of the committee to make some arrangement with me by which I can leave at this time, and to defer the vote until I can return.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. How long?

Mr. TILLMAN. Until to-morrow. I should like to have the bill go over after the Senator from New Hampshire gets through, or the Senate can discuss the bill as long as it pleases, so it does not come to any vote.

Before I leave that point, though, I wanted to ask permission of the Senator from New Hampshire to put in the RECORD the very enormous estimates made by the Armor Factory Board, of which Commodore Howell was president. There were four other naval officers on the board. Here are their names:

J. A. Howell, commodore, United States Navy, president Armor Factory Board; A. H. McCormick, captain, United States Navy; Mordecai T. Endicott, civil engineer, United States Navy; James H. Perry, chief engineer, United States Navy; F. F. Fletcher, lieutenant, United States Navy.

With the most elaborate and expensive machinery that was then conceivable the total given by these gentlemen, who are all competent engineers, amounts to only \$3,747,000.

Mr. CHANDLER. Does that include the steel plant?

Mr. TILLMAN. It includes everything. It includes open-hearth department, forging and cementing shop, bending and tempering shop, machine shop, erecting shop, boiler house, power plant, and so on, \$3,747,000. I will put it in the RECORD, so that Senators can see it.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator can speak again to-morrow.

Mr. TILLMAN. I am not trying to speak now. I want to ask the Senator from Maine to let me off, and I want the Senator from New Hampshire to please let me put the figures in, so that Senators who want to look at it in the morning can do so.

Mr. CHANDLER. I wish the Senator would comment on the figures to-morrow.

The statement submitted by Mr. TILLMAN is as follows:

Estimated cost of proposed Government armor factory.

Name of department.	Buildings and foundations.	Machinery, furnaces, stacks, etc.	Total.
Open-hearth department	\$210,398.70	\$331,519.35	\$541,918.05
Forging and cementing shop	186,630.74	1,371,607.20	1,558,237.94
Bending and tempering shop	85,494.75	260,544.15	346,038.90
Machine shop	140,577.35	460,073.98	600,651.33
Erecting shop	67,761.78	28,700.00	96,461.78
Boiler house	44,074.60	75,500.00	119,574.60
Power plant	31,258.80	103,400.00	134,658.80
Blacksmith shop	13,070.89	19,341.10	32,411.99
Locomotive house	6,804.13	415.00	7,219.13
Carpenter shop	5,467.83	3,219.00	8,686.83
Office building	15,000.00	-----	15,000.00
Chemical laboratory	6,000.00	19,000.00	25,000.00
Physical laboratory	6,000.00	27,000.00	33,000.00
Railroad tracks and equipment	86,642.76	-----	86,642.76
Latrines	11,112.00	-----	11,112.00
Water supply, sewerage, etc.	33,298.00	-----	33,298.00
Total	949,502.33	2,798,319.78	3,747,822.11

Mr. HALE. If the Senator from New Hampshire will allow me, as the Senator from South Carolina, who has led the debate on that side of the question, is obliged to leave town, I shall not, of course, ask that the matter be closed to-night, as I had hoped to have done. Does the Senator prefer that the discussion shall now be suspended in order that he may listen to it to-morrow?

Mr. TILLMAN. I would not undertake to take the Senator from New Hampshire off his feet. He is in one of the most brilliant and effective speeches I have ever listened to from him.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am much obliged to the Senator.

Mr. TILLMAN. And Senators are for the first time to-day in their seats and are taking some interest in the question of armor plate. I certainly would not undertake to stop his speech. I want him to go on, and I think he can convert the whole Senate, so that in the morning the Senator from Maine himself will give up the convictions he has had and vote with us.

Mr. HALE. At the end of the most interesting remarks of the Senator from New Hampshire I will ask that the Senate adjourn; and I shall try to call the bill up at the end of the routine morning business to-morrow.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, as is usually the case when I am interrupted in this way, I find I am nearly done. I do wish, if I can, to drive away the atmosphere of impossibility with which naval officers and others have endeavored to envelop this subject. I know of no way in which we can control the price of armor plate except by building an armor factory. I have very reluctantly come to this conclusion. I had supposed that the armor-plate makers would give reasonable terms to the Government. They have not done so, and I have been growing strong in the conviction as other Senators have been growing strong in the conviction for the last two or three years that if we are to build armored battle ships in the future of this country we need an armor-plate factory just as much as we need navy-yards, so that we can hold over the builders of ships and the builders of machinery in this country the possibility of construction by the Government.

I have not been and am not now an advocate of building the hulls or the machinery of naval vessels in the navy-yards, but I should be very unwilling to blot our navy-yards out of existence. If we were to do it, the cost of naval engines and of all ships would be doubled upon us; and whenever anyone should say anything in favor of economy in naval construction and should vote to refuse to submit to the unjust demands of the combined shipbuilders of the country, he would be called unpatriotic and would be accused of neglecting the true interests of the United States. So, Mr. President, as the navy-yards are a protection against any extortion on the part of the shipbuilders, the armor plant which we will establish, if wise counsels prevail, will be a protection against any extortion on the part of these two combined manufacturers of armor plate.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, unless the Senator from Maine desires, I shall prefer not to go on to-night. I will be guided by his wishes.

Mr. HALE. On the intimation that I gave to the Senator from South Carolina that I would not seek to go on after the Senator from New Hampshire has concluded his remarks, I will, with the leave of the Senator from Massachusetts, be holding the floor, move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator withhold his motion for a few moments?

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE subsequently said: I desire to make an inquiry. I should like to ask if it was understood that I had the floor on the naval bill when it was laid aside?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine stated that the Senator from Massachusetts had the floor. The Chair will recognize the Senator from Massachusetts immediately after the routine business to-morrow when the bill is laid before the Senate.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not understand that any Senator can hold the floor over night.

Mr. LODGE. That is constantly done. I simply wish to understand if I am entitled to the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will recognize the Senator from Massachusetts to-morrow.

MARGARET H. KENT.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read:

To the Senate of the United States:

In compliance with a resolution of the Senate of the 7th instant (the House of Representatives concurring), I return herewith the bill of the Senate numbered 232, entitled "An act granting an increase of pension to Margaret H. Kent."

EXECUTIVE MANSION, May 9, 1900.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, as I understand the matter, the beneficiary under this bill is dead. I move that the votes of the Senate whereby the bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed be reconsidered.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

STATUE OF HENRY WADSWORTH LONGFELLOW.

Mr. HOAR. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate joint resolution No. 48, providing for the selection of a site for a statue in honor of Henry W. Longfellow. I am requested by the chairman of the Committee on the Library, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. WETMORE], to call up the joint resolution, as he is obliged to be away.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. R. 48) directing the selection of a site for the erection of a bronze statue in Washington, D. C., in honor of the late Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, which had been reported from the Committee on the Library with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of War, the officer in charge of public buildings and grounds, and the chairmen of the Senate and House Committees on the Library are hereby appointed as a commission to select a site upon property belonging to the United States in the city of Washington, other than the Capitol or Library grounds, for the erection of a statue in bronze of the late Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, to be provided by the Longfellow Memorial Association.

SEC. 2. That for the preparation of the site so selected and the erection of a pedestal upon which to place said statue, and the reasonable expense of superintendence and inspection of the same, under the direction of the officer in charge of public buildings and grounds, the sum of \$4,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A joint resolution authorizing the selection of a site and the erection of a pedestal for a bronze statue in Washington, D. C., in honor of the late Henry Wadsworth Longfellow."

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. HALE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After seven minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, May 10, 1900, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 9, 1900.

APPOINTMENT IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

Forty-sixth Infantry.

Sergt. Maj. William H. Clendenin, Forty-sixth Infantry, United States Volunteers, to be second lieutenant, May 8, 1900, vice Kavanagh, promoted.

PROMOTION IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Jay H. Sypher, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 11th day of January, 1900, vice Lieut. Reynold T. Hall, promoted.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 9, 1900.

CONSUL-GENERAL.

E. C. Bellows, of Washington, to be consul-general of the United States at Yokohama, Japan.

CONSUL.

Henry Bordewich, of Minnesota, now consul of the United States at Christiania, Norway, to be consul-general of the United States at that place, to take effect July 1, 1900.

GOVERNOR OF HAWAII.

Sanford B. Dole, of Hawaii, to be governor of the Territory of Hawaii, an original appointment under the provisions of the act of Congress entitled "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii," approved April 30, 1900.

SECRETARY OF HAWAII.

Henry E. Cooper, of Hawaii, to be secretary of the Territory of Hawaii, an original appointment under the provisions of the act of Congress entitled "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii," approved April 30, 1900.

POSTMASTERS.

John M. Oat, to be postmaster at Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii.

Harry S. Edwards, to be postmaster at Macon, in the county of Bibb and State of Georgia.

Daniel Williams, to be postmaster at Sharon, in the county of Mercer and State of Pennsylvania.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, May 9, 1900.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House joint resolution 198, providing for the printing and distribution of the general report of the expedition of the steamer *Fishhawk* to Porto Rico, including the chapter relating to the fish and fisheries of Porto Rico, as contained in the Fish Commission Bulletin for 1900, with Senate amendments, and the Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read the amendments.

Mr. HEATWOLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Printing, I move to concur in the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

On motion of Mr. HEATWOLE, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 9496. An act to provide for the disposal of Fort Buford abandoned military reservation, in the States of North Dakota and Montana.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

"S. R. 121. Joint resolution for the appointment of first lieutenants of volunteers in the Signal Corps of the Army;

S. 2345. An act directing the issue of a duplicate of a lost check drawn by William H. O. Comegys, major and paymaster, United States Army, in favor of George P. White;

S. 323. An act granting homesteaders on abandoned military reservations the right to enter one quarter section of public land on said reservations as pasture or grazing land;

S. 4462. An act to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department, and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes," approved June 10, 1896;

S. 124. An act regulating permits for private conduits in the District of Columbia;

S. R. 107. Joint resolution to provide for a survey of the Illinois River;

S. 2729. An act granting a pension to Eliza L. Reese; and
S. 4509. An act declaring the city of Everett, Wash., to be a port of entry in the Puget Sound customs collection district.